



FORM A: BLANK NOTICE OF INTENT TO CLAIM INTERVENOR COMPENSATION

FILED**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

12:06 PM

Order Instituting Rulemaking on California Advanced Electric Rate Design	Rulemaking 26-04-009 (Filed April 9, 2026)
---	---

R2604009

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO CLAIM INTERVENOR COMPENSATION
AND, IF REQUESTED (and [X]¹ checked), ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S
RULING ON 350 BAY AREA'S SHOWING OF SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL
HARDSHIP**

NOTE: AFTER ELECTRONICALLY FILING A PDF COPY OF THIS NOTICE OF INTENT, PLEASE EMAIL THE DOCUMENT IN AN MS WORD FORMAT TO THE INTERVENOR COMPENSATION PROGRAM COORDINATOR AT lcompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov.

Customer or Eligible Local Government Entity (party intending to claim intervenor compensation): 350 Bay Area

Assigned Commissioner: John Reynolds

Administrative Law Judge: Joanna Perez-Green

I hereby certify that the information I have set forth in Parts I, II, III and IV of this Notice of Intent is true to my best knowledge, information and belief.

Signature:

Claire Broome

Date: July 16, 2026

Printed Name: Claire Broome

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

(To be completed by the party intending to claim intervenor compensation)

A. Status as "customer" (see Pub. Util. Code § 1802(b))² The party claims "customer" status because the party is (check one):	Applies (check)
1. A Category 1 customer is an actual customer whose self-interest in the proceeding arises primarily from his/her role as a customer of the utility and, at the same time, the customer must represent the broader interests of at least some other customers. See, for example, D.08-07-019 at 5-10).	☐

¹ DO NOT CHECK THIS BOX if a finding of significant financial hardship is not needed (in cases where there is a valid rebuttable presumption of eligibility (Part III(A)(3)) or significant financial hardship showing has been deferred to the intervenor compensation claim).

² All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

2. A Category 2 customer is a representative who has been authorized by actual customers to represent them. Category 2 involves a more formal arrangement where a customer or a group of customers selects a more skilled person to represent the customer's views in a proceeding. A customer or group of customers may also form or authorize a group to represent them, and the group, in turn, may authorize a representative such as an attorney to represent the group.	☐
3. A Category 3 customer is a formally organized group authorized, by its articles of incorporation or bylaws to represent the interests of residential customers or small commercial customers receiving bundled electric service from an electrical corporation (§1802(b)(1)(C)). Certain environmental groups that represent residential customers with concerns for the environment may also qualify as Category 3 customers, even if the above requirement is not specifically met in the articles or bylaws. See D.98-04-059, footnote at 30.	☒
4. The party's detailed explanation of the selected customer category. <u>The party's explanation of its status as a Category 3 customer.</u> <i>If the party represents residential and small commercial customers receiving bundled electric service from an electrical corporation, it must include in the Notice of Intent either the percentage of group members that are residential ratepayers or the percentage of the members who are receiving bundled electric service from an electrical corporation. Supporting documentation for this customer category must include current copies of the articles of incorporation or bylaws. If current copies of the articles and bylaws have already been filed with the Commission, only a specific reference (the proceeding's docket number and the date of filing) to such filings needs to be made.</i> 350 Bay Area is a Category 3 “group or organization authorized pursuant to its articles of incorporation or bylaws to represent the interests of residential ratepayers” and provided copies of the Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation, and related materials in the NOI submitted in R.21-06-017 on September 13, 2021. 350 Bay Area's Articles, Bylaws and policies authorize and require it to represent the environmental interests of its members – including participating in activities with governmental agencies and other bodies to promote equitable policies supporting electrification, renewable energy transition and fair practices on behalf of the public and our supporters and volunteers who take residential service as customers of electric utilities and community choice energy providers. 350 Bay Area's Board and members have determined that participation in some Public Utilities Commission proceedings is necessary for their interests in energy generation, consumption, and associated environmental impacts to be adequately represented. 350 Bay Area is a 501c3 (educational non-profit) corporation recognized in California and by the IRS, and meets the definition of a Category 3 customer	

provided in Public Utilities Code section 1802(b)(1)(C). 350 Bay Area is a “representative of a group or organization authorized pursuant to its articles of incorporation or bylaws to represent the interests of residential customers” 350 Bay Area is a non-profit, member-based, “public benefit” California corporation with over 20,000 members living in California, primarily in the PG&E service territory. 350 Bay Area’s members are entirely (100%) residential ratepayers, reflecting a contemporaneous typical proportion of customers in the nine Bay Area counties within PG&E service territory who are bundled Investor-Owned Utility (“IOU”) customers, CCA customers, and local municipal utility customers. 350 Bay Area’s environmental concerns are focused on human induced emissions and their impact on the environment we all live within, with particular attention to disproportionate and inequitable impact on vulnerable populations. 350 Bay Area works to develop effective policies to reduce greenhouse gas and related emissions through development of clean energy resources that help the state meet its air quality and climate protection goals, create jobs for California families, and reduce our dependence on fossil fuels. 350 Bay Area advocates for widespread electrification of transportation and buildings, and the use of demand-side resources including efficiency, conservation, local solar, and related measures to reduce fossil fuel use and large scale infrastructure impacts on the environment. The Commission has “granted customer status to organizations, such as environmental groups, that represent ratepayer interests that are not solely economic, recognizing that participation in Commission proceedings by parties representing the full range of affected interests is important.” (D.06-12-041 at 7) 350 Bay Area brings to this proceeding unique perspective on rate design grid impacts, value, and customer participation related to locally installed efficiency, demand reduction, renewable generation and other load mitigation measures collectively associated with Distributed Energy Resource (DER) policy, and coordination with California’s other climate and equity related energy goals. We seek a finding of eligibility and financial hardship in order to participate effectively. Lastly, we note that a prior finding of ineligibility in an earlier proceeding relied on facts that have long since been addressed (a minor donation more than seven years ago from an individual who was a market participant and a former board member who was related to a board member who was a market participant). While 350 Bay Area disagrees with that Decision, these issues were promptly cured as soon as they were raised and are no longer applicable.	
Do you have any direct economic interest in outcomes of the proceeding? ³ If “Yes”, explain:	☐ Yes ☐ No
B. Conflict of Interest (§ 1802.3)	Check
1. Is the customer a representative of a group representing the interests of small commercial customers who receive bundled electric service from an electrical corporation?	☐ Yes ☐ No

2. If the answer to the above question is “Yes”, does the customer have a conflict arising from prior representation before the Commission?	☐ Yes ☐ No
---	---

³ See Rule 17.1(e).

C. Status as an Eligible Local Government Entity (§§1802(d), 1802.4, 1803.1)	
The party claims “eligible local government entity” status because the party is a city, county, or city and county that is not a publicly owned public utility that intervenes or participates in a Commission proceeding for the purpose of protecting the health and safety of the residents within the entity’s jurisdiction following a catastrophic material loss suffered by its residents either in significant damage to infrastructure or loss of life and property, or both, as a direct result of public utility infrastructure.	☐ Yes ☐ No
The party’s explanation of its status as an eligible local government entity must include a description of (1) The relevant triggering catastrophic event; (2) The impacts of the triggering catastrophic event on the residents within the entity’s jurisdiction as a result of public utility infrastructure; and (3) The entity’s reason(s) to participate in this proceeding.	N/A
D. Timely Filing of Notice of Intent to Claim Intervenor Compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)(1)):	
1. Is the party’s NOI filed within 30 days after a Prehearing Conference? Date of Prehearing Conference: 9/16/2022	☐ Yes ☐ No
2. Is the party’s NOI filed at another time (for example, because no Prehearing Conference was held, the proceeding will take less than 30 days, the schedule did not reasonably allow parties to identify issues within the timeframe normally permitted, or new issues have emerged)?	☐ Yes ☐ No
2a. The party’s description of the reasons for filing its NOI at this other time:	
2b. The party’s information on the proceeding number, date, and decision number for any Commission decision, Commissioner ruling, Administrative Law Judge’s ruling, or other document authorizing the filing of NOI at that other time:	

PART II: SCOPE OF ANTICIPATED PARTICIPATION
(To be completed by the party intending to claim intervenor compensation)

A. Planned Participation (§ 1804(a)(2)(A)):
The party’s statement of the issues on which it plans to participate: 350 Bay Area is a non-profit organization focused on ensuring a sustainable climate and associated environmental and economic justice for all, with immediate mission directed interest in the Commission developing policies and programs to reduce both the costs borne by ratepayers and the externalized impacts on communities and the environment. This includes 1. Updating rate design principles to advance state goals, particularly in regard to advancing building and transportation electrification, affordability, efficiency, and impact reduction; 2. Leveraging the latent potential of demand flexibility for more efficient operation of the electric system for utilization of renewable resources and reduced or avoided growth in capacity driven costs, largely

through Time of Use (“TOU”) rate reform; 3. Consideration of fixed charges in light of 1 & 2; and 4. Consideration of additional pilots, tariffs, programs, and/or studies as warranted.

We seek to ensure that policies on rates and tariffs serve to both enable participation and reduce inequitable energy burdens for all residential ratepayers, including 350 Bay Area members, and that programs and tariffs are specifically aligned with electrification of the transportation and building sectors. (See Estimated Budget By Issues listed below)

The party’s explanation of how it plans to avoid duplication of effort with other parties:

350 Bay Area is actively coordinating with other parties to avoid duplication of effort, especially with regard to overlapping areas of special environmental concern. Whenever there are overlapping efforts, concerns, and recommendations, 350 Bay Area will seek to coordinate its participation with other parties to avoid duplication, resolve issues ahead of time, and utilize joint comments whenever the opportunity is applicable and available.

The party’s description of the nature and extent of the party’s planned participation in this proceeding (to the extent that it is possible to describe on the date this NOI is filed).

350 Bay Area is uniquely engaging experts in health and in economic analysis of non-wires alternatives to the rapid growth in ratepayer infrastructure costs for this proceeding to assess actual rate impacts. These individuals have actively engaged in related proceedings and will introduce or reference relevant work in DER avoided costs, distribution planning, societal costs, environmental impacts, and related studies. Additionally, 350 Bay Area is committed to racial, economic, and environmental justice and will actively support input from local and regional organizations representing historically impacted communities.

350 Bay Area has submitted Opening and Reply comments on the OIR and a post-prehearing conference Statement. We anticipate participating in all workshops, hearings, and related meetings as well as submitting comments and may participate in any settlement negotiations, should they occur. 350 Bay Area plans to work actively with parties to ensure that missing or incomplete consideration of factors is addressed in refinement of proposals.

B. The party’s itemized estimate of the compensation that the party expects to request, based on the anticipated duration of the proceeding (§ 1804(a)(2)(A)):

Item	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$	#
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES				
[Attorney 1]				
[Attorney 2]				
[Expert 1] Kenneth Sahm White	40	\$540	\$21,600	1
[Expert 2] Claire Broome, MD	60	\$395	\$23,700	2
[Advocate 1]				
[Advocate 2]				
Subtotal: \$45,300				
OTHER FEES				
[Person 1]				
[Person 2]				
Subtotal: \$0				
COSTS				

[Item 1]				
[Item 2]				
Subtotal: \$0				
TOTAL ESTIMATE: \$45,300				
Estimated Budget by Issues: • Rate design to advance state goals: 25% • TOU rates update: 30% • fixed charge: 30% • Data Centers and additional issues arising in the proceeding: 15% The total hours and percentage for each issue area is an initial estimate and will be adjusted in response to final scoping of issues and to avoid duplication of effort with other parties Comment #1 The requested rate for Mr. White reflects the \$270/hr rate awarded for 2011 work in D.13-12-023, \$300/hr rate awarded for 2016 work in D.16-11-017 plus subsequent awards and increases authorized by the Commission. Comment #2 The requested median rate for Dr. Broome as a level V Health Scientist reflects experience since 2015 in prior related IDER and IRP proceedings, extensive academic expertise over 12 years related to economic values of health impact, and 15 years policy experience as program developer and manager and as deputy director for the Centers for Disease Control in developing and implementing public health policy, supplementing her medical career.				
<i>When entering items, type over bracketed text; add additional rows to table as necessary. Estimate may (but does not need to) include estimated Claim preparation time. Claim preparation time is typically compensated at ½ professional hourly rate.</i>				

PART III: SHOWING OF SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL HARDSHIP
(To be completed by party intending to claim intervenor compensation;
see Instructions for options for providing this information)

A. The party claims that participation or intervention in this proceeding without an award of fees or costs imposes a significant financial hardship, on the following basis:	Applies (check)
1. The customer cannot afford, without undue hardship, to pay the costs of effective participation, including advocate's fees, expert witness fees, and other reasonable costs of participation. (§ 1802(h))	☐
2. In the case of a group or organization, the economic interest of the Individual members of the group or organization is small in comparison to the costs of effective participation in the proceeding. (§ 1802(h))	☐
3. The eligible local government entities' participation or intervention without an award of fees or costs imposes a significant financial hardship. (§ 1803.1(b).)	☐

4. A § 1802(h) or § 1803.1(b) finding of significant financial hardship in another proceeding, made within one year prior to the commencement of this proceeding, created a rebuttable presumption in this proceeding (§ 1804(b)(1)). Commission's finding of significant financial hardship made in proceeding number: Date of Administrative Law Judge's Ruling (or CPUC Decision) in which the finding of significant financial hardship was made:	☐
B. The party's explanation of the factual basis for its claim of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(h) or § 1803.1(b)) (necessary documentation, if warranted, is attached to the NOI: The cost of the organization's participation in CPUC proceedings, which is estimated to be in excess of \$45,000, substantially outweighs the benefit to the individual members it represents. Intervenor's members are typical cross section of residential customers whose individual economic interests are small relative to the costs of participation in this proceeding but who share a strong commitment to equitably reducing toxic and GHG emissions and other social and environmental impacts. Intervenor's members will not see financial benefits that approach or exceed the Intervenor's costs of participation. 350 Bay Area represents the environmental and social justice interests of its members. As a non-profit organization with very limited resources, 350 Bay Area relies upon intervenor compensation to be able to effectively advocate in these proceedings. 350 Bay Area does not anticipate any challenge to its eligibility for compensation in this proceeding. If any party does attempt to challenge Bay Area's eligibility, 350 Bay Area requests that it be granted the opportunity to reply to such party's allegations within 10 days after the service of such filing.	

**PART IV: ATTACHMENTS DOCUMENTING SPECIFIC
ASSERTIONS MADE IN THIS NOTICE**

(The party intending to claim intervenor compensation identifies and attaches documents;
add rows as necessary)

Attachment No.	Description
1	Certificate of Service
2	
3	
4	
5	

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE RULING⁴
(Administrative Law Judge completes)

	Check all that apply
1. The Notice of Intent (NOI) is rejected for the following reasons:	☐
a. The NOI has not demonstrated the party's status as a "customer" or an "eligible local government entity" for the following reason(s):	☐
b. The NOI has not demonstrated that the NOI was timely filed (Part I(B)) for the following reason(s):	☐
c. The NOI has not adequately described the scope of anticipated participation (Part II, above) for the following reason(s):	☐
2. The NOI has demonstrated significant financial hardship for the reasons set forth in Part III of the NOI (above).	☐
3. The NOI has not demonstrated significant financial hardship for the following reason(s):	☐
4. The Administrative Law Judge provides the following additional guidance (see § 1804(b)(2)):	☐

IT IS RULED that:

1. The Notice of Intent is rejected.	☐
2. The customer or eligible local government entity has satisfied the eligibility requirements of Pub. Util. Code § 1804(a).	☐
3. The customer or eligible local government entity has shown significant financial hardship.	☐
4. The customer or eligible local government entity is preliminarily determined to be eligible for intervenor compensation in this proceeding. However, a finding of significant financial hardship in no way ensures compensation.	☐
5. Additional guidance is provided to the customer or eligible local government entity as set forth above.	☐

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

⁴ A Ruling needs not be issued unless: (a) the NOI is deficient; (b) the Administrative Law Judge desires to address specific issues raised by the NOI (to point out similar positions, areas of potential duplication in showings, unrealistic expectations for compensation, or other matters that may affect the customer or eligible local government entity's Intervenor Compensation Claim); or (c) the NOI has included a claim of "significant financial hardship" that requires a finding under § 1802(h).

Administrative Law Judge