STATE OF CALIFORNIA GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

FILED

07/08/26

10:46 AM

R2005003

July 8, 2026

Agenda ID #24361
Ratesetting

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN RULEMAKING 20-05-003:

This is the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge Julie Fitch and Colin Rizzo. 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 August 13, 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.**

/s/ MICHELLE COOKE

Michelle Cooke
Chief Administrative Law Judge

MLC: vj4
Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ FITCH & RIZZO (Mailed 7/8/2026)**

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

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

DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO GREEN POWER INSTITUTE FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISIONS (D.) 23-02-040 AND D.24-02-047

Intervenor: Green Power Institute	**For contribution to Decision (D.) 22-05-015, D.23-02-040 and D.24-02-047**
Claimed: $226,275.00	**Awarded:** $97,456.25
Assigned Commissioner: John Reynolds[1]	**Assigned ALJs:** Julie A. Fitch and Colin Rizzo[2]

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	D.22-05-015 Modified Cost Allocation Mechanism for Opt-Out and Backstop Procurement Obligations D.23-02-040 Ordering Supplemental MTR Procurement and Transmitting Portfolios to CAISO for the TPP D.24-02-047 Adopting 2023 Preferred System Plan and Related Matters, Including Two PFMs

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812[3]:

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	July 14, 2020	Verified

[1] This proceeding was reassigned to Commissioner John Reynolds on March 11, 2026.
[2] Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Colin Rizzo was co-assigned with ALJ Julie A. Fitch to Rulemaking 20-05-003 on March 19, 2025.
[3] All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

2. Other specified date for NOI:	See below, section C, comment no. 1.	In accordance with the OIR for R.20-05-003 and as detailed in I(C)(1) below, GPI was previously found eligible to request compensation in R.16-02-007. Thus, according to the OIR, GPI did not need to file an NOI in this proceeding.
3. Date NOI filed:		
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:	R.22-10-010	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	May 15, 2023	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	D.24-01-047	D.24-01-047 did not make an independent finding on eligible customer status pursuant to §1802(b). D.24-01-047 used an earlier finding, under the rebuttable presumption rule of §1804(b)(1). That earlier finding has expired.
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:	R.20-05-002	R.22-10-010
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	November 20, 2020	May 15, 2023. The May 15, 2023 Ruling made a preliminary finding of significant

		financial hardship but requested additional information from GPI. On June 22, 2023, GPI responded to the Ruling, by filing a Supplement to the NOI in that proceeding.
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	D.24-01-047	D.24-01-047 did not make an independent finding on significant financial hardship pursuant to §1802(h). D.24-01-047 used an earlier finding, under the rebuttable presumption rule of §1804(b)(1). That earlier finding has expired. The finding of significant financial hardship has been made in the decision on GPI's claim filed in R.22-10-010.
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.24-02-047	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	February 20, 2024	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	April 16, 2024	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
1	The OIR for this proceeding states, on pg. 20: "Parties who were previously found eligible to request compensation	Verified

	in R.16-02-007 shall remain eligible in this proceeding and do not need to file an NOI within 30 days, provided there are no material changes in their by-laws or financial status." GPI was found eligible in R.16-02-007 (D.18-07-019, D.19-12-019, and D.21-03-040), and so, per instructions in the OIR, remains eligible in this proceeding.	
2		The May 15, 2023, ALJ Ruling on GPI's NOI requested additional financial information before making a finding of "significant financial hardship." On June 22, 2023, GPI submitted the requested additional information in the filed Supplement to the NOI. D.24-08-054 granted GPI a finding of significant financial hardship in R.22-10-010.

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
	(Please note that Attachment 2 includes a list of issue areas and GPI Pleadings relevant to this Claim.)	Noted
1. Modified CAM for Opt Out and Backstop Procurement. The GPI made a substantial contribution to Decision D.22-05-015 by arguing that the issue of whether RECs can be unbundled from the underlying energy has already been settled in the RPS proceeding through the VAMO process, and that taking any action in the IRP proceeding would only muddy the waters. This was a live issue in the deliberations that led to the PD, and the PD correctly deferred to the RPS	**Decision D.22-05-015** GPI's comments on the proposed decision focus on only one issue, which is whether RPS RECs should be allowed to be unbundled from the energy procured, and also whether the GHG attributes of that energy are embedded in the RPS REC. GPI argues that the RPS rules already govern this sort of issue, and therefore this decision does not need to add additional prohibitions. Since we are now deferring to the VAMO process to address allocation of RPS attributes, we do not address this comment from GPI further in this decision. [D.22-05-015, pg. 60.]	Noted, however as stated in the decision, the Commission does not address these comments from GPI given that the VAMO process was deferred to for addressing allocation of RPS attributes.

proceeding for settlement. As cited in the Decision, this was our main issue in the MCAM deliberation, and the Decision adopted our position.		
2. Supplemental MTR Procurement. The GPI made substantial contributions to Decision D.23-02-040 by advocating for procurement based on a better understanding of need, based on a more structured approach to procurement planning, without depending on fossil resources, and with greater resource diversity within the new procurement order. Our analyses and many of our suggestions were adopted by the Commission, and in cases where they were not adopted they enriched the record upon which the Commission made its decisions.	**Decision D.23-02-040** GPI supports adding baseline resource capacity not yet online to LSEs' 2025 obligations, but would do it based on load share. GPI also notes that the Commission would need to clarify if the additional 2025 NQC would need to meet a specific procurement category as defined by D.21-06-035 or if it would be limited by D.19-11-016 requirements. GPI also recommends that the Commission make clear that fossil-fueled resources should not be allowed to count for any reallocated NQC requirements. [D.23-02-040, pgs. 14-15.] Finally, with respect to concerns raised by GPI, among other parties, we encourage LSEs to continue procuring resources in advance of any additional orders or our adoption of a comprehensive procurement program framework. Using whatever mechanism we adopt, we expect to give credit for and take into account proactive and early procurement by LSEs. [D.23-02-040, pg. 33.] GPI argues for the inclusion of more baseload renewable resources, favoring high-reliability and resource diversity (D.23-02-040, pg. 55). Numerous parties comment with concern that this decision orders another tranche of capacity procurement outside of the programmatic framework that is being developed. Those parties include: … GPI, ... On this issue, we state our	Noted, however the reference that GPI provides here only points to the decision's summary of GPI's comments. A mere reference to or summary of your own comments within a decision does not establish that those comments were considered, adopted, or relied upon by the Commission, either in whole or in part. The decision does not acknowledge that GPI's comments influenced its final decision. Noted, however the reference that GPI provides here only points to the decision's summary of GPI's comment, and/or notes that it was one of many parties to make the same comment. Noted, however the reference that GPI provides here only

	commitment to continuing to develop the programmatic framework for procurement in IRP in this proceeding. We expect this to be a near-term priority for 2023. [D.23-02-040, pg. 69.]	points to the decision's summary of GPI's comment, and/or notes that it was one of many parties to make the same comment.
3. Portfolios for the CAISO TPP. The GPI made substantial contributions to Decision D.23-02-040 by analyzing and critiquing the TPP portfolios proposed in the staff proposal, supporting the 30 MMT greenhouse-gas limit on the base case portfolio, and proposing an alternate sensitivity based on high baseload renewable content. Our analyses and many of our suggestions were adopted by the Commission, and in cases where they were not adopted they enriched the record upon which the Commission made its decisions.	**Decision 23-02-040** The clear majority of parties in this proceeding support the staff recommendation to use a 30 MMT GHG base case, with the higher electrification load assumptions. Those parties supporting include: … GPI … [D.23-02-040, pg. 49.] GPI suggests a portfolio with a high amount of geothermal or otherwise firm and diverse resources. CalCCA supports this suggestion for future TPP cycles. [D.23-02-040, pg. 64.]	Noted, however the references that GPI provides here only points to the decision's summary of GPI's comments, and/or notes that it was one of many parties to make the same comments. A mere reference to or summary of your own comments within a decision does not establish that those comments were considered, adopted, or relied upon by the Commission, either in whole or in part.
4. 2023 Preferred System Plan. The GPI made numerous substantial contributions to Decision D.24-02-047, beginning with performing analyses of the individual IRPs of the IOUs, CCAs, and ESPs, followed by making a series of proposals for the final 2023 Preferred System Plan (PSP). GPI's proposals and suggestions included updating the resource baseline, making the core portfolio based on the	**Decision D.24-02-047** GPI and ACP-CA were concerned that the baseline should be adjusted because it does not appropriately account for uncontracted and potentially retiring baseline resources. [D.24-02-047, pg. 58.] With respect to the recommended PSP portfolio, the majority of parties supported the selection of the 25 MMT Core portfolio as the PSP portfolio, including at least 23 parties that explicitly supported this choice in their comments. These parties were: …, GPI … [D.24-02-047, pg. 58.]	Noted, however the references that GPI provides here only points to the decision's summary of GPI's comments, and/or notes that it was one of many parties to make the same comments. A mere reference to or summary of your own comments within a decision does not establish that those comments

25 MMT greenhouse-gas emissions limit, including a high baseload renewables scenario, using a better modeling platform than Resolve, better alignment with other agencies in anticipation of offshore wind development, and excluding the use fossil resources as bridge resources. Our analyses and many of our proposals and suggestions were adopted by the Commission, and in cases where they were not adopted they enriched the record upon which the Commission made its decisions.	GPI also commented in general on the additional economic benefits of in-state resources rather than imported renewables. [D.24-02-047, pg. 59.] NRDC/UCS and GPI generally advocated [regarding OSW issues] for increased alignment between the Commission and other state agencies for planning and goals (D.24-02-047, pg. 59). Some parties also recommended additional sensitivities. … GPI recommended analyzing scenarios that add defined volumes of high capacity factor resources (e.g., OSW) and then allowing RESOLVE to fill in around those chosen resources. [D.24-02-047, pgs. 62-63.] GPI proposed performing a high-baseload-renewables sensitivity (D.24-02-047, pg. 78). GPI also recommended rejecting the allowance to use bridge resources, since they include fossil-fueled resources (D.24-02-047, pg. 100). A few parties express concern about the Commission's modeling tools used to develop the portfolios in the proposed decision. … SCE also suggests that the Commission conduct an overall assessment of the RESOLVE model, which GPI suggests is not suitable for IRP use. [D.24-02-047, pg. 117.] GPI also requests several changes to the proposed decision to address its comments on the October 5, 2023 ALJ ruling. We have made those clarifications in the text, where warranted. [D.24-02-047, pg. 119.] … GPI, … all support the High Gas Retirement sensitivity in comments. GPI	were considered, adopted, or relied upon by the Commission, either in whole or in part.

	also supports developing an alternative that reduces overreliance on solar and storage resources. [D.24-02-047, pg. 120.] We do agree with GPI, however, that an unspecified import contract or a contract with an emitting resource would not meet the spirit, due to requirements that Diablo Canyon's eventual retirement not increase emissions. Thus, any clean firm energy contract contemplated would need to be with an RPS-eligible or non-emitting resource. [D.24-02-047, pg. 123.]	Verified
5. Petition for Modification. The GPI made substantial contributions to Decision D.24-02-047 by opposing the SCE/PG&E PFM to delay the due dates for the tranche of capacity ordered in D.21-06-035 for the replacement of capacity that will be lost with the retirement of the Diablo Canyon Nuclear power plant. We pointed out that delaying the installation date for the tranche would not only make it more difficult for the utility to retire the plant, it would also bring into question the ability of the utilities (SCE and PG&E) to act as backup procurers in the event that other LSEs fail to meet their own obligations in the tranche. The Decision rejects the PFM.	**Decision D.24-02-047** GPI also opposed the SCE/PG&E PFM, stating that the PFM lacks public quantitative justification, is inequitable, and also calls into question the ability of the IOUs to act as backstop procurement entities in the event that other LSEs fail to procure their required resources for D.21-06-035 capacity in general. In its response to the PFM, GPI also recommended that the Commission model the impacts of the proposed DCPP replacement extension. [D.24-02-047, pgs. 91-92.]	Noted, however the references that GPI provides here only points to the decision's summary of GPI's comments. A mere reference to or summary of your own comments within a decision does not establish that those comments were considered, adopted, or relied upon by the Commission, either in whole or in part. The decision does not acknowledge that GPI's comments influenced its final decision.

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?	Yes	Verified
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Verified
c. If so, provide name of other parties: TURN, CEERT, LSSA, CalWEA, CESA, Cal. ISO, and the three large electric IOUs.		Noted
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: This proceeding covers a wide variety of topics related to energy resource procurement and planning in California. The Green Power Institute has been an active participant in the Commission's LTPP and IRP proceedings since the inception of the general procurement program, and is continuing these efforts in the present proceeding (R.20-05-003). The Green Power Institute coordinated its efforts in this proceeding with other parties in order to avoid duplication of effort, and added significantly to the outcome of the Commission's deliberations through our own unique perspective. Some amount of duplication has occurred in this proceeding on all sides of contentious issues, but Green Power avoided duplication to the extent possible, and tried to minimize it where it was unavoidable.		Noted

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

	CPUC Discussion
a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness: The GPI is providing, in Attachment 2, a listing of the pleadings we provided in this Proceeding that are relevant to matters covered by this Claim, and in Attachment 3, a detailed breakdown of GPI staff time spent for work performed that was directly related to our substantial contributions to Decisions D.22-05-015, D.23-02-040, and D.24-02-047. The hours claimed herein in support of Decisions D.22-05-015, D.23-02-040, and D.24-02-047 are reasonable given the scope of the Proceeding and the strong participation by the GPI. GPI staff maintained detailed contemporaneous time records indicating the number of hours devoted to the matters settled by this Decision in this case. In preparing Attachment 3, Dr. Morris reviewed all of the recorded hours devoted to this proceeding, and included only those that were reasonable and contributory to the underlying tasks. As a result, the GPI submits that all of the hours included in the attachment are reasonable, and should be compensated in full.	After the adjustments made to this claim, the remainder of the claimed costs are reasonable. *See* Part III.D CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments below.

Dr. Morris is a renewable energy analyst and consultant with more than 40 years of diversified experience and accomplishments in the energy and environmental fields. He is a nationally recognized expert on biomass and renewable energy, climate change and greenhouse-gas emissions analysis, integrated resources planning, and analysis of the environmental impacts of electric power generation. Dr. Morris holds a BA in Natural Science from the University of Pennsylvania, an MSc in Biochemistry from the University of Toronto, and a PhD in Energy and Resources from the University of California, Berkeley. Dr. Morris has been actively involved in electric utility restructuring in California throughout the past three decades. He served as editor and facilitator for the Renewables Working Group to the California Public Utilities Commission in 1996 during the original restructuring effort, consultant to the CEC Renewables Program Committee, consultant to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research on renewable energy policy during the energy crisis years, and has provided expert testimony in a variety of regulatory and legislative proceedings, as well as in civil litigation. Dr. Zoë Harrold has worked for the Green Power Institute (GPI) for a total of more than 10 years, as a Research Assistant from 2006 to 2008, and again as a Scientist from 2015 to present. Through her work with the GPI she has been engaged with the development of the Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), and the Integrated Resources Planning (IRP) framework. Her work with the RPS includes crosschecking renewable resource procurement within RPS Compliance Report spreadsheets, reviewing and summarizing RPS proceedings, identifying loopholes, and assisting in the preparation of pleadings. Her work with the IRP proceeding includes preparing comments and recommendations on behalf of the GPI based on critical reviews of the IOUs' and other LSEs' IIRPs and subsequent Proposed Decisions, working group reports, workshop materials, demonstration proposals and final reports, and third-party comments. Dr. Harrold earned a Ph.D. in geomicrobiology from the University of Washington, Department of Earth and Space Science in 2014. Her work on modeling networks in the environment has strong ties to her analytical work in the IRP proceeding. Decision D.98-04-059 states, on pgs. 33-34, "Participation must be productive in the sense that the costs of participation should bear a reasonable relationship to the benefits realized through such participation. … At a minimum, when the benefits are intangible, the customer should present information sufficient to justify a Commission finding that the overall benefits of a customer's participation will exceed a customer's costs." This proceeding is concerned with the refinement of elements of the state's IRP program, and the ongoing administration of the program. The cost reductions and environmental benefits that result from our input to the process overwhelm the cost of our participation.	
b. Reasonableness of hours claimed: The GPI made Significant Contributions to Decisions D.22-05-015, D.23-02-040, and D.24-02-047 by actively participating in workshops and working groups, and providing a series of Commission filings on the various topics that were under	After the adjustments made to this claim, the remainder of the

consideration in the Proceeding and are covered by this Claim. Attachment 3 provides a detailed breakdown of the hours that were expended in making our Contributions. The hourly rates and costs claimed are reasonable and consistent with awards to other intervenors with comparable experience and expertise. The Commission should grant the GPI's claim in its entirety.	claimed hours are reasonable. *See* Part III.D CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments below.
c. Allocation of hours by issue: 1. Modified CAM for Opt Out and Backstop Procurement 5% 2. Supplemental MTR Procurement 30% 3. Portfolios for the CAISO TPP 20% 4. 2023 Preferred System Plan 40% 5. Petitions for Modification 5%	Noted; totals 100%.

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						**CPUC AWARD**		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Total $**
G. Morris	2022	108.00	465	D.23-11-036	50,220	45.25 [3]	$450.00 [1]	$20,362.50
G. Morris	2023	47.50	485	See comment 1	23,038	23.75 [3]	$460.00 [1]	$10,925.00
G. Morris	2024	16.50	505	See comment 1	8,333	8.25 [3]	$475.00 [1]	$3,918.75
Z. Harrold	2022	216.00	285	See comment 2	61,560	103.00 [3]	$250.00 [2]	$25,750.00
Z. Harrold	2023	229.00	300	See comment 2	68,700	114.50 [3]	$260.00 [2]	$29,770.00
Z. Harrold	2024	33.50	310	See comment 2	10,385	16.75 [3]	$260.00 [2]	$4,355.00
Subtotal: $222,235						***Subtotal: $ 95,081.25***		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Hours**	**Rate**	**Total $**
G. Morris	2024	16.00[4]	252.5	½ 2024 rate	4,040	10.00 [4]	$237.50 [1]	$2,375.00

[4] Timesheets provided by GPI list total of 21.00 hours allocated to Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation.

Subtotal: $4,040	***Subtotal: $2,375.00***
TOTAL REQUEST: $226,275	***TOTAL AWARD: $97,456.25***

*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. 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.

**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III[5]:

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Attachment 1	Certificate of Service
Attachment 2	Allocation of effort by issue, list of pleadings
Attachment 3	Breakdown of hourly efforts by issue category
Attachment 4	10/6/22 Informal Comments (see Att. 2)
Attachment 5	6/21/22 Informal Comments (see Att. 2)
Comment 1	The Commission has adopted a 4.46 percent adjustment for rates in the Market Rate Study for converting 2022 rates to 2023 values, and 4.07 percent for converting 2023 rates to 2024 values. These values can be found on the Escalation tab of the Hourly Rate Chart spreadsheet on the Commission's web site. We apply the 4.46 percent escalator to the approved 2022 hourly rate for Dr. Morris, which is $465/hr (D.23-11-036), and round to the nearest 5 percent for 2023 per established Commission practice, to produce a rate of $485/hr. We apply the 4.07 percent escalator to the 2023 hourly rate for Dr. Morris, and round to the nearest 5 percent for 2024 per established Commission practice, to produce a rate of $505/hr.
Comment 2	Dr. Harrold's currently approved rate for 2021 is based on the old (pre-2021 Market Rate Study) system. As of the date of this Application she does not yet have an approved rate for 2022, 2023 or 2024. GPI is requesting that for 2022 and following years Dr. Harrold's rate be converted to a Market Rate Study basis. For 2021, the basis year in the Hourly Rate Chart, Dr. Harrold is qualified as a Level IV Public Policy Analyst (8 years of practice before the Commission plus 4 years credit for a PhD degree), the range in the table is $263.72-$493.98. We are asking for a rate for Dr. Harrold that is based on the Hourly Rate Chart's basis year of 2021 of $280/hr. Applying the 3.31, 4.46 and 4.07 escalators and rounding to the nearest five each time produces a 2022 rate of $285/hr, a 2023 rate of $300/hr, and

[5] Attachments not included in the final Decision.

	a 2024 rate of $310/hr. Those are the rates that we are requesting in this Application.

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

On September 16, 2025, a ruling was issued requesting GPI to submit additional information for various claims because the Commission had identified several issues within the claims, including: omission of required information, unclear or inconsistent details, invoices that did not align with submitted timesheets or hours claimed, invoices that included work unrelated to the claim at issue, making it difficult to determine which rates / hours apply to the specific claim, invoices billed to other entities that did not identify GPI or the consultant, and other inconsistencies that hindered the Commission's ability to evaluate and resolve the claims.

GPI was provided with an opportunity to submit supplemental information, including resumes for all individuals for whom compensation is sought, invoices reflecting the actual billed rates for each consultant (broken down by claim), and consultant agreements for those retained on a contingency basis, where payment of consulting fees is deferred and contingent upon the receipt of an IComp award.

GPI filed its response for supplement information for this proceeding on October 14, 2025. In its response, GPI confirmed the following:

1. GPI is a program of the Pacific Institute and is not a separate or independent entity and does not conduct business outside of or apart from the Pacific Institute.

2. GPI is a registered fictitious business name of the Pacific Institute and is the renewable energy program of the Pacific Institute.[6] (However, the Commission notes that this fictious business name expired in 2018).

3. Gregg Morris' agreement with the Pacific Institute is that when intervenor compensation payments are made to GPI, the Pacific Institute retains their overhead charge and pays the rest to Morris via Future Resources Associates, his dba company.

4. Through Future Resources Associates, Morris pays consultants an initial upfront payment, followed by a second payment once the intervenor compensation award is issued).

5. GPI states that the remaining award is used to pay the carrying costs of participation in Commission proceedings, the cost of the risk that not all hours in a given claim will be approved for payment, and the salary of Morris.

6. GPI states that Morris works entirely on a contingency basis and does not issue monthly invoices.

[6] Public records found at Alameda County Clerk Recorder Office's reflect that fictious business name Green Power Institute, was active from 6/11/2013 to 6/11/2018 and is currently expired.

We make the following adjustments below based on the information at hand and an assessment of GPI's contribution to the decision.

Item	Reason
[1] Gregg Morris' (Morris) 2022, 2023 and 2024 Hourly Rates	Although GPI continues to identify Morris as an employee of GPI, serving as its director, supplemental information provides conflicting information and confirms that Morris is dba Future Resources Associates, working on a contingency basis for the Pacific Institute, meaning that Morris has agreed to defer his consulting fee contingent upon receipt of this intervenor compensation award. Given this contingency, we utilize the reasonable rates established by Resolution ALJ-393 based on Morris' experience as an Advocate - Executive Director - Level V. Given Morris' experience, we approve an hourly rate of $450 for 2022, $460 for 2023, and $475 for 2024. We apply one-half of Morris' adopted 2024 rate of $475 for an Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation rate of $237.50.
[2] Zoë Harrold's (Harrold) 2022, 2023 and 2024 Hourly Rates	Although GPI continues to identify Harrold as a staff associate of GPI, supplemental information provided confirms that Harrold is a consultant, who in turn bills Future Resources Associates, (not GPI or the Pacific Institute) for work in this proceeding. The Commission requested supplemental documentation be submitted by GPI to confirm the rates charged by Harrold. GPI filed the "Associate Service Agreement Addendum"[7] between Future Resources Associates (Morris) and Harrold under seal, but states that per the terms of the contract, Harrold has been hired on a contingency basis where Harrold receives an initial payment upon invoicing, followed by a second payment contingent upon receipt of this intervenor compensation award. Based on these terms, we approve an hourly rate of $250 for 2022, and $260 for 2023 and 2024. 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. We reiterate that it is the responsibility of the intervenor to be forthcoming about engaging consultants and the terms of the contract, to adhere to the

[7] Because the Associate Service Agreement Addendum between Future Resources Associates and Harrold was filed under seal, we do not disclose here how the reduction is specifically calculated.

	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. In this instance, GPI did not provide all the documentation pertaining to the contract terms in the initial claim and waited until the Commission requested supplemental documentation, which significantly delayed the processing of these claims.
[3] Lack of Substantial Contribution	Public Utilities Code § 1802(j) states that a substantial contribution "has substantially assisted the commission in the making of its order or decision because the order or decision has adopted in whole or in part one or more factual contentions, legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations presented by the customer." The courts have addressed the requirement of substantial contribution in, for example, TURN v. CPUC 166 Cal.App. 4th 522 (2008), stating at 11: "[T]o be eligible for compensation, the statute requires that the customer have made a 'substantial contribution' to the PUC's proceedings, as the PUC determines. "'Substantial contribution' means that, in the judgment of the commission, the customer's presentation has substantially assisted the commission in the making of its order or decision…." In evaluating whether GPI made a substantial contribution here, the Commission evaluates whether the hours claimed were commensurate with the contributions claimed by the intervenor. Making a substantial contribution in and of itself does not entitle an intervenor to all its claimed fees and costs. Compensation is granted for efficient, meaningful contributions. Accordingly, we make the following adjustments. **<u>D.22-05-015: Modified CAM for Opt-out and Backstop (27.50 reduced)</u>** GPI does not meet the substantial contribution standards of Section 1802(j) or Section 1802.5 regarding all comments related to Modified Cost Allocation Mechanism for Opt-out and Backstop Procurement Obligations, as GPI's arguments regarding these issues had no impact on the proceeding in a manner that helped the Commission reach a decision. D.22-05-015 deferred to the VAMO process to address allocation of RPS attributes and stated that GPI's comments were not addressed. Therefore, the burden is on the party claiming a substantial contribution to explain how the argument it presented assisted the Commission in the decision-making process, thereby benefiting or influencing the Decision. Because we find GPI's contribution associated with D.22-05-015 not compensable, all hours for 2022 allocated to this issue are reduced. • Gregg Morris: 17.50 hours • Zoë Harrold: 10.00 hours **<u>Lack of Contribution to D.23-02-040 and D.24-02-047:</u>**

The Commission notes that most of GPI's inputs lacked substance, and most of its efforts did not substantially contribute to the proceeding's outcomes. GPI's contributions did not result in a substantial contribution to the final decision because they duplicated the positions taken by other parties in the proceeding without providing meaningful input to the positions advocated by other parties; or otherwise addressed comments that did not influence the decision-making process.

In 2022 and 2023, we observe that GPI spent an excessive 178.00 hours reviewing, drafting, and reading comments associated with the 40 IIRPs, parties' opening comments on IRP program development and GPI's reply comments on the IRP program development. GPI largely summarized the findings of other parties and produced 41 pages (Comments by GPI on 2022 IIRP on 12/02/22, 30 pages and Reply comments on IRP program development on 01/09/23, 11 pages) summarizing other parties' proposals and comments. GPI failed to provide a unique perspective on many of the issues and did not substantially contribute to the proceeding's outcomes.

The Commission also notes that GPI's Reply Comments on the 2023 Proposed System Planning and Transmission Planning Process largely summarized the proposed decision and relitigated issues raised in the proceeding. As required by Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the comments did not focus on factual, legal, or technical errors in the proposed decision. The burden of proof is on the intervenor to show that each of the hours claimed was spent productively to make a substantial contribution to the decision.

Additionally, the Commission observes that GPI claimed time to attend an En Banc on natural gas prices and it is unclear how attendance at the En Banc was necessary or contributed meaningfully to the Commission's decision-making process. The Commission underscores that mere attendance at such meetings does not guarantee compensation without production of documents that substantially contribute to the outcome of a proceeding.

As a result, analysis of GPI's filings demonstrates that minimal portions of GPI's pleadings contributed to the proceeding's outcomes. Based on the foregoing, GPI has failed to demonstrate how the excessive time claimed for preparing or presenting contentions or recommendations made a substantial contribution to the final decision. Accordingly we reduce 50% of the claimed attorney hours for work on these issues.

Name	Year	Hours Remaining after Reductions for D.22-05-015	Hours Reduced	Hours Awarded
Gregg Morris	2022	90.50	45.25	45.25
Gregg Morris	2023	47.50	23.75	23.75

	<table><tr><td>Gregg Morris</td><td>2024</td><td>16.50</td><td>8.25</td><td>8.25</td></tr><tr><td>Zoë Harrold</td><td>2022</td><td>206.00</td><td>103.00</td><td>103.00</td></tr><tr><td>Zoë Harrold</td><td>2023</td><td>229.00</td><td>114.50</td><td>114.50</td></tr><tr><td>Zoë Harrold</td><td>2024</td><td>33.50</td><td>16.75</td><td>16.75</td></tr></table>
[4] Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation Hours	GPI claims a total of 16.00 hours for Intervenor Compensation (IComp) Claim Preparation hours in 2024; however, timesheets submitted by GPI reflect a total of 21.00 hours dedicated to this task. This is excessive given the scope of this proceeding and relative to other intervenors claiming contribution to the same decisions. Additionally, we note that there were several issues with the claim, including omission of required information, unclear or inconsistent details, and other inconsistencies that hindered the Commission's ability to evaluate and resolve the claim. Therefore, we only award 10.00 hours for IComp Claim Preparation.
[5] Intervenor Responsibility for Transparency	The Commission takes this opportunity to remind all intervenors that they bear the burden of providing accurate, complete, and honest information in all compensation requests. The Commission relies on intervenors' good faith representations, particularly regarding consultant agreements and payments, as

and Accuracy in Compensation Requests	it does not have the resources to review every contract or non-standard arrangement in detail. Intervenor compensation is funded by ratepayers, and the Commission takes seriously any effort to mislead or obscure the financial basis for a claim. We remind intervenors that under Rule 1.1, intent to deceive is not required for a violation, misstatements may still be actionable. Dishonest or misleading claims not only risk denial of compensation but may also subject the intervenor to penalties. The Commission has clear authority to audit intervenors' books and records to verify the basis for any award. Intervenors must therefore ensure full transparency regarding actual time spent on issues, consultant fees, payment arrangements, and the actual disbursement of funds. Failure to meet this obligation undermines the integrity of the compensation process and may lead to denial of claims or further enforcement action.
Other Comments	Upon closer review of the Associate Service Agreement Addendum, we find that the compensation GPI is requesting for the consultant’s time significantly exceeds the actual rate and compensation the consultant would receive under the contract terms. The Intervenor Compensation Program is funded by ratepayers and is intended to reimburse reasonable costs of participation rather than generate profit from outsourced consultant services. As established in D.07-01-009, D.08-04-010, and Resolution ALJ-235, the rate requested by an intervenor must not exceed the actual rate billed by the consultant. Because the consultant has agreed to be paid a percentage of the Commission approved rate and hours, the requested compensation in this claim does not accurately reflect the actual cost of the consultants’ services. Compensating GPI the full request would result in an overpayment with the remaining balance retained by Morris, dba Future Resources Associates, instead of covering the consultant’s actual fees. Therefore, in instances where compensation to the intervenor for the consultant’s time exceeds the amount the intervenor will actually pay the consultants under their contract terms, the Commission will reduce the award to match the actual cost incurred. While the reductions applied to this claim prevent an overpayment in this instance, we remind GPI that any compensation request for consultant services must strictly align with actual contract terms. Intervenor compensation is intended to cover the true costs of participation and is not a mechanism for generating profit retained by Future Resources Associates (Morris).
Other Comments	The Commission finds the deficiencies in this filing to be concerning and expects a higher standard of transparency and diligence moving forward. The submission was not only missing essential documentation but also contained misleading information regarding consultant terms, inaccurate timesheets and

	missing invoices. This resulted in inefficient use of the intervenor's own time and an undue burden on Commission staff resources to reconcile these errors. Please be advised that future claims lacking necessary supporting evidence will be assessed solely on the information provided; if the Commission cannot verify portions of the claim, those portions may be denied ensuring the program operates efficient for all participants.

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))?	No

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Green Power Institute has not made a substantial contribution to D.22-05-015 but has made a substantial contribution in some aspects to D.23-02-040, and D.24-02-047.

2. The requested hourly rates for Green Power Institute's representatives, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services, and/or reflect the actual rates billed to, and paid by the intervenor, for consultant services rendered.

3. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.

4. The total of reasonable compensation is $97,456.25

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. Green Power Institute is awarded $97,456.25.

2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company shall pay Green Power Institute their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2023 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. If such data is unavailable, the most recent electric revenue data shall be used. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning June 30, 2024, the 75th day after the filing of Green Power Institute's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision is not waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated _____________, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2302040 and D2402047		
Proceeding(s):	R2005003		
Author:	ALJ Julie A. Fitch and ALJ Colin Rizzo		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Green Power Institute	April 16, 2024	$226,275	$97,456.25	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
Gregg	Morris	Expert[8]	465	2022	$450
Gregg	Morris	Expert	485	2023	$460
Gregg	Morris	Expert	505	2024	$475
Zoë	Harrold	Scientist[9]	285	2022	$250
Zoë	Harrold	Scientist	300	2023	$260
Zoë	Harrold	Scientist	310	2024	$260

(END OF APPENDIX)

[8] Morris has been identified as a consultant for GPI.
[9] Harrold has been identified as a consultant for GPI.