

Decision _____



FILED

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

26-07-007

11:24 AM

A2506022

Application of SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY (U 902-E) for Approval of Low-Income Assistance Programs and Budgets for Bridge Funding for Program Year 2027

Application 25-06-022
(Filed June 27, 2025)

And Related Matters

Application 25-06-023
(Filed June 27, 2025)

Application 25-06-024
(Filed June 30, 2025)

Application 25-06-025
(Filed June 30, 2025)

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY (CforAT)

NOTE: After electronically filing a PDF copy of this Intervenor Compensation Claim (Request), please email the document in an MS WORD and supporting EXCEL spreadsheet to the Intervenor Compensation Program Coordinator at Icompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov.

Intervenor: CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY (CforAT)		For contribution to Decision (D.) 26-07-007	
Amount Requested: \$ 37,356.50		Awarded: \$	
Assigned Commissioner: Garrett Toy		Assigned ALJ(s): Mathew Baker	
I hereby certify that the information I have set forth in Parts I, II, and III of this Claim is true to my best knowledge, information and belief. I further certify that, in conformance with the Rules of Practice and Procedure, this Claim has been served this day upon all required persons (as set forth in the Certificate of Service attached as Attachment 1).			
Signature:		<i>/s/ Melissa W. Kasnitz</i>	
Date: September 3, 2026	Submitted by:	Melissa W. Kasnitz	

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES
(to be completed by Intervenor except where indicated)

A. Brief description of Decision:	Decision 26-07-007 (the Final Decision) approves activities and budgets for the 2027 Income-Qualified Programs for San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Gas Company, Southern California Edison Company, and Pacific Gas and Electric Company. It also provides guidance on issues deferred for consideration to the full-cycle proceeding initiated in January of 2026.
--	---

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812¹:

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	8/18/2025	
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI filed:	9/17/2025	
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		
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.25-04-010, see comment below	
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	6/3/26	
7. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b)):		
8. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.25-04-010, see comment below	
9. Date of ALJ ruling:	6/3/26	
10. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		

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

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804I):		
11. Identify Final Decision:	D.26-07-007	
12. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	7/8/2026	
13. File date of compensation request:	9/3/2026	
14. Was the request for compensation timely?		

C. Additional Comments on Part I: (use line reference # as appropriate)

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
	Prior Eligibility Findings: At the time this proceeding was initiated, the most recent finding of eligibility for CforAT had been issued on March 15, 2024 in R.22-11-013. This was more than a year prior to the initiation of this proceeding, so CforAT requested a ruling on eligibility in our NOI, filed on 9/17/25. The Commission did not issue a finding of eligibility in this proceeding, but it did issue such a finding on June 3, 2026 in R.25-04-010.	

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION
(to be completed by Intervenor except where indicated)

A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (see § 1802(j), § 1803(a), 1803.1(a) and D.98-04-059): (For each contribution, support with specific reference to the record.)

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
Overview: Throughout this proceeding, CforAT represents the interests of utility customers with disabilities and medical needs. Because this population is disproportionately low-income	This overview is intended to provide context for our direct contributions in this proceeding. The specific contributions advanced by CforAT through our participation in the proceeding are detailed below.	

and highly dependent on access to reliable and affordable energy to support their ability to live independently, CforAT regularly participates in proceedings addressing California’s income-qualified energy programs (previously referred to as “low-income programs) managed by the Commission.

In this bridge-year funding proceeding, CforAT sought to ensure smooth operation of the programs while the next full-cycle program review takes place and to ensure ongoing focus on protecting the needs of our constituency.

In support of our constituency, CforAT’s formal participation in this proceeding included the following written contributions to the record:

- CforAT’s Response to Applications, filed on July 31, 2025;
- Rebuttal Testimony of Melissa W. Kasnitz on Behalf of CforAT, including attachments, issued on December 19, 2025 and entered into the record as Exhibit CforAT-01 (Testimony) and Exhibit CforAT-02 (Attachments) via the Administrative Law Judge Ruling on Exhibit Motions, issued on February 17, 2026 (Kasnitz Testimony).
- CforAT Opening Brief, filed on February 20, 2026;

• CforAT Reply Brief, filed on March 27, 2026; and • CforAT Comments on Bridge Funding PD, filed on June 18, 2026. CforAT also appropriately participated in various stakeholder activities, including the prehearing conference and various meet and confer efforts with other parties, and monitored all aspects of the proceeding in keeping with our professional responsibilities.		
CHANGES Program: CforAT supported adoption of a Staff Proposal that recommended an increase to the CHANGES program budget; CHANGES includes support for customers with disabilities and assistance for customers who use American Sign Language to communicate. Kasnitz Testimony at p. 2; Opening Brief at pp. 1-4; Reply Brief at p. 2. CforAT also recommended that the Commission consider consolidating the CHANGES program with the ongoing CBO Pilot authorized in R.18-07-005, while noting that this would have to be done in the full-cycle proceeding. CforAT described how the funding increase in this proceeding can begin to provide support for customers who do not currently receive support due to budget constraints, while also	The Final Decision adopts the increased CHANGES budget recommended in the Staff Proposal and supported by CforAT and other parties. Final Decision at pp. 55-56. The Final Decision does not address CforAT’s recommendations on potential consolidation of the CBO Pilot and CHANGES for consideration. These recommendations were identified as appropriate for consideration in the full-cycle proceeding that is now underway. To the extent that the Commission determines that CforAT’s analysis of this issue did not contribute to the Final Decision issued in this proceeding, we request authorization to resubmit the time spent addressing program consolidation in A.26-01-003 et al. We provide an estimated breakdown of time spent supporting budget increases and proposing program consolidation in the allocation of issues, below.	

supporting an overall reconsideration of the program in the full-cycle proceeding. Kasnitz Testimony at pp. 2-4; Opening Brief at pp. 1-4; Reply Brief at pp. 2-3.		
FERA: CforAT supported Cal Advocates' recommendation to deny a request by SCE to substantially increase its CARE budget and contributed to the review of whether SCE's estimates for increases to program enrollment were reasonable. Opening Brief at pp. 5-6; Kasnitz Testimony at pp. 4-5. CforAT also addressed the issue of IOU efforts to increase enrollment in FERA and argued that the Commission should adopt a process that allows for effective stakeholder input on the efforts undertaken by the IOUs to obtain such increases. Comments on Bridge Funding PD at pp. 1-3. Because the Commission indicated its intent to issue a Resolution in response to a Tier 2 Advice Letter on enrollment efforts (an act that is within the Commission's discretion), CforAT indicated our expectation that this process will suffice for stakeholder input. <i>Id.</i>	In response to the concerns expressed by Cal Advocates and CforAT, the Commission confirmed that SCE's forecast subsidy costs are not a budget request, and actual costs are considered in a different proceeding. Final Decision at p. 22. By eliciting this clarification, CforAT and Cal Advocates enhanced the record of the proceeding and assisted the Commission's deliberations. While adopting the IOUs' request to address SB 1130 Enrollment Efforts through a Tier 2 Advice Letter process rather than a Tier 3 Advice Letter process, the Final Decision retains the Commission's intent to subsequently address the contents of the advice letter through a resolution process. Final Decision at p. 24. The resolution process allows input from stakeholders and results in an action by the Commission that can support a claim for intervenor compensation, which addresses CforAT's concerns.	
Studies and Working Groups/Effective Participation – Compensation: CforAT sought clarification regarding intervenors'	The Final Decision authorizes ongoing activity for the ESA	

eligibility for compensation for participation in various activities involving studies and working groups taking place while this proceeding has been active, but where resolution or other further action may not take place until the full-cycle proceeding. CforAT Comments on PD at p. 4. CforAT also raised concerns about the availability of compensation for ongoing work that spanned both this proceeding and the full-cycle proceeding in our Response to the Applications. <i>Id.</i> at pp. 3-5.	Working Group and the ESA/CARE Study Working Group. Final Decision at pp. 50-51. It subsequently clarifies that intervenor participation in working group activities authorized in this decision may be recovered in A.26-01-003 et al. Final Decision at p. 67. CforAT's efforts to elicit this clarification are important to the ability of intervenors to contribute in areas where stakeholder participation is determined to be significant. It is appropriate for CforAT to be compensated now for obtaining this clarification. To the extent that the Commission determines that any work by CforAT in relation to ongoing studies and working groups is not appropriate for compensation at this time, the Commission should authorize CforAT to resubmit such time for compensation in the full-cycle proceeding, A.26-01-003.	
Procedural Contributions/Effective Participation – LINA	The Final Decision supports ongoing activities related to the 2028 LINA, which was authorized in D.21-06-015, and approves funding for the IOUs to pay their allocated share of the study budget. Final Decision at pp. 49-50. Part of the LINA process is to seek stakeholder input on the study plan and at other key stages. Just as it is appropriate to allocate ratepayer funds to the IOUs for their work on the LINA, it is appropriate to compensate intervenor stakeholders for their contributions in developing the LINA study plan.	
Procedural Contributions/Effective Participation – CAS		

CforAT participated in the authorized CAS Working Group, with Policy Analyst Kate Woodford serving as our representative. As set forth in A.25-08-002, seeking compensation for CforAT's work on the CAS resulting in Resolution E-5394 (which remains pending at this time), The CAS Working Group was tasked "with providing design recommendations and advice to Energy Division to guide the RFP Development, contract negotiation, and system development for Phase I [of the CAS]. Application 25-08-002 at p. 6. CforAT's inclusion in the CAS Working Group was vetted and approved by Energy Division, which continued to meet after the issuance of Resolution E-5394 to address Phase II Recommendations.	As with CforAT's work on other studies and working groups, this participation is both authorized and, in this case, directly approved by the Commission (Energy Division) as important for development of tools that the Commission has determined to be in the public interest. CforAT's ability to provide important stakeholder input in this type of working group is dependent on our ability to receive compensation for this work, consistent with ratepayer support for the work done by the IOUs. The Commission has already determined that CforAT's participation in the group would be appropriate based on our ability to make important contributions. In order to allow such work to continue, compensation is appropriate. See CforAT's comment below for additional discussion of this issue.	
--	--	--

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	
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Multiple parties, including CforAT, supported the recommendations of a staff proposal to increase the program budget for CHANGES. This included TURN as well as several of the IOUs. However, CforAT was the leading advocate seeking consideration of whether CHANGES should be consolidated with the CBO Pilot.		

CforAT worked cooperatively with the IOUs and other stakeholders in developing the 2028 LINA study plan and participating in development of the CAS. On other issues, CforAT's position was similar to various advocate parties, including TURN and Cal Advocates.	
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: At all times in this proceeding, CforAT represented the unique perspective of utility customers with disabilities who participate in the programs under review. While other advocates represent the interests of low income customers in general, CforAT's constituency is not only disproportionately low-income (and thus in need of effective support from CARE, FERA and ESA) but also highly dependent on the availability of reliable and affordable energy and support to retain their ability to live independently. Because of the unique needs of this group, it is appropriate for them to have independent representation, even when CforAT's broad perspective may be consistent with that of other consumer advocates. Beyond the need for targeted representation of the interests of customers with disabilities, CforAT worked cooperatively with other intervenors and advocates to avoid duplication, and where we addressed the same issues, we worked to bring separate analysis and targeted input on behalf of our constituency. To the extent that CforAT's positions overlapped to some extent the positions of other advocates, this reflects shared concerns about the impact of the programs under review. CforAT coordinated with the other active parties to address such issues of shared concern, and any remaining limited duplication does not support a reduction in compensation.	

C. Additional Comments on Part II: (use line reference # or letter as appropriate)

#	Intervenor's Comment	CPUC Discussion
	As noted above, CforAT believes that it is appropriate to seek compensation at this time for work on ongoing matters such as the 2028 LINA, the CAS, and recommendations for a review of the CHANGES program in the pending full-cycle application proceeding. In each of these	

#	Intervenor's Comment	CPUC Discussion
	matters, CforAT has worked directly with the IOUs, whose efforts are supported with ratepayer funds. The Commission has determined that ongoing work on these programs is in the public interest and has asked for stakeholder input and participation. The Commission has indicated that both policymakers and the public benefit from input from a broad ranges of stakeholders, including advocates for vulnerable communities. By working to ensure that these programs and studies proceed effectively, CforAT is working to effectuate the will of the Commission. The Commission has already determined that such ongoing participation is reasonable and useful. To the extent that CforAT is able to work cooperatively with the IOUs, the Commission and public benefit. However, to the extent that compensation for ongoing work is unavailable, even as ratepayers support the work by the IOUs, CforAT's ability to participate in this manner is constrained. We have demonstrated that it would be a financial hardship to participate before the Commission but for the availability of intervenor compensation. On this basis, we believe an award of compensation for work on ongoing activities, including consideration of the CHANGES program, is appropriate at this	

#	Intervenor's Comment	CPUC Discussion
	time. To the extent the Commission disagrees, we request a determination that we can pursue compensation for our work on the ongoing studies and program review in A.26-01-003 et al.	

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION
(to be completed by Intervenor except where indicated)

A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§ 1801 and § 1806) to be completed by Intervenor:

	CPUC Discussion
a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness: CforAT's participation in this proceeding ensured that the Commission considered the impacts of the IOUS' bridge year proposals on our unique constituency of customers who rely on support from CARE, FERA and ESA and helped support the smooth operation of these programs while the Commission considers the IOUs' full-cycle applications. It is difficult to assign a dollar value to the benefits of ensuring that the needs of this vulnerable customer group are addressed as part of ongoing program oversight. Even so, the importance of the issues under consideration in this proceeding is high for all low-income customers and even greater for CforAT's constituency of customers with disabilities and medical needs who depend on affordable, reliable and accessible utility service to support their ability to live independently. Given the importance of those issues, CforAT's level of participation was appropriate	
b. Reasonableness of hours claimed: CforAT's work in this proceeding was led by Legal Director Melissa Kasnitz, who has substantial experience working with the low-income (or income-qualified) programs managed by the Commission. Her work is efficient and effective based on this experience and familiarity with the programs at issue. Where appropriate, Ms. Kasnitz delegated tasks to CforAT's junior attorney, Rachel Sweetnam, with appropriate supervision. This type of delegation with oversight is appropriate and efficient, particularly in light of the substantial differences in the hourly rates of Ms. Kasnitz and Ms. Sweetnam.	

	CPUC Discussion
CforAT also involved our policy analyst, Kate Woodford, with much of her time spent addressing issues involving the Concurrent Application System (CAS). Ms. Woodford was CforAT’s representative on the Working Group that produced recommendations for the next phase of the CAS (See Resolution E-529). Her participation on related issues in this proceeding was effective and efficient. Ms. Woodford also participated on issue involving the CHANGES program and the LINA, where she also has familiarity and experience considering the needs of CforAT’s constituency with regard to these activities.	
c. Allocation of hours by issue: Kasnitz Hours – 2025 (22.5 hours total) CHANGES: 3.4 hours (15%) The issue area “CHANGES” includes time spent analyzing the CHANGES program, reviewing and preparing comments and testimony on the program, and other work addressing management of the program. We estimate that approximately 50% of the time spent on the CHANGES issue area addressed support for budget increases and approximately 50% addressed our proposal to consolidate the program with the CBO Pilot. FERA: 0.2 hours (<1%) The issue area “FERA” includes time spent analyzing the FERA program, reviewing and preparing comments and testimony on the program, and other work addressing management and funding of the program. General Participation: 8.1 hours (36%) The issue area “General Participation” includes time spent on matters that cannot easily be classified under other issue areas. This time primarily includes preliminary review of the applications and work done prior to the PHC, including the identification of issues and areas of focus for the ongoing proceeding. LINA: 1.1 hours (5%) The issue area “LINA” includes time spent working with the IOUs on the review of the 2025 LINA and development of the study plan for the 2028 LINA. Procedural: 4.2 hours (19%) The issue area “Procedural” includes time spent on necessary procedural matters, including reviewing rulings, addressing proceeding status, and engaging in activities such as required meet and confer efforts. Rule 1.1 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure requires all persons	

	CPUC Discussion
who enter an appearance before the Commission to act in accordance with the laws of the state and the rules of the Commission. As a matter of professional responsibility, it is appropriate and necessary for an attorney participating in a proceeding to review filings and engage appropriately on procedural matters, and it is appropriate for time spent on such activity to be compensated, as it is necessary in support of any additional contributions. Testimony: 5.5 hours (24%) The issue area “Testimony” includes time spent reviewing the testimony of other parties and developing CforAT’s rebuttal testimony. CforAT’s testimony focused on the CHANGES program, the FERA program, and the status of ongoing activities and studies such as the ESA Working Group and various studies, including work that will extend into the full-cycle application. Where an activity focused on just one of these items, it is classified as work on that issue, even when it involved the review or production of testimony. However, most time entries identified as “Testimony” cannot be separated into time spent on various issues. Overall, we estimate that the breakdown of time spent on time records classified as “Testimony” as follows: CHANGES: 40%; FERA: 20%; ongoing activities/studies/the upcoming full cycle proceeding: 40%. Sweetnam Hours – 2025 (2.9 hours total) FERA: 0.7 hours (24%) Testimony: 2.2 hours (76%) Woodford Hours – 2025 (4.7 hours total) CAS: 2.0 hours (43%) CHANGES: 1.4 hours (30%) FERA: 0.5 hours (10%) LINA: 0.8 hours (17%) Kasnitz Hours – 2026 (16.6 hours total) Brief: 9.1 hours The issue area “Brief” includes time spent drafting CforAT’s opening brief, reviewing other parties’ briefs (including the issues identified in briefing) and drafting CforAT’s reply brief. While it is not possible to break the	

	CPUC Discussion
time entries identified as “brief” into time spent on separate issues, we estimate overall breakdown as follows: CHANGES: 50%; FERA: 30%; Other issues: 20%. CHANGES: 0.4 hours PD: 4.0 hours The issue area “PD” includes time spent reviewing the Proposed Decision on bridge funding, preparing comments and consideration of the comments of other parties. Procedural: (3.1 hours) Woodford Hours – 2026 (1.9 hours total) CAS: 1.6 hours Procedural: 0.3 hours	

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2025	22.50	\$ 755	D.25-10-060	\$ 16,987.50			
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2026	16.6	\$ 780	D.26-07-022	\$ 12,914.00			
Rachel Sweetnam	2025	2.9	\$ 275	D.25-10-050	\$ 797.50			
Kate Woodford	2025	4.7	\$ 300	D.26-05-031	\$ 1,410.00			
Kate Woodford	2026	1.9	\$390	See comment below	\$ 741.00			
Subtotal: \$ 32,850.00						Subtotal: \$		

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
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]								
[Person 2]								
<i>Subtotal: \$</i>						<i>Subtotal: \$</i>		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2025	1.4	\$ 377.50	½ approved rate	\$ 528.50			
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2026	10.2	\$ 390.00	½ approved rate	\$ 3,978.00			
<i>Subtotal: \$ 4,506.50</i>						<i>Subtotal: \$</i>		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
1.								
2.								
<i>Subtotal: \$</i>						<i>Subtotal: \$</i>		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$ 37,356.50						TOTAL AWARD: \$		
*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. **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 ²	Member Number		Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation			
Melissa W. Kasnitz		1992	162679		No			

² This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <https://apps.calbar.ca.gov/attorney/LicenseeSearch/QuickSearch>.

CLAIMED			CPUC AWARD
Rachel Sweetnam	2023	350075	No

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III³:
(Intervenor completes)

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	Time Records (Merits and Compensation)
	Woodford 2026 Rate Justification: Kate Woodford has worked as a Public Policy Analyst at CforAT since 2015 (initially under contract and since 2018 as an employee). Her 2024 rate as a Public Policy Analyst – Level III was adopted in D.25-07-028. In 2025, Ms. Woodford should have been designated as a Public Policy Analyst – Level IV, with an associated increase in her allocated rate. CforAT sought an increased rate, but in the request in which her rate was evaluated, CforAT inadvertently failed to provide a detailed justification for the increase; without a justification, the Commission simply set her 2025 rate based on the application of the annual escalation factor to her 2024 rate. <i>See</i> D.26-05-031. For 2026, CforAT expressly requests that Ms. Woodford’s rate be set based on her appropriate placement as a Level IV Public Policy Analyst. Based on the Hourly Rate Chart provided by the Commission and adjusted for the effective period of 2026, the rate range for this classification runs from a low of \$338.68 per hour to a high of \$568.94 per hour, with a median of \$448.16 per hour. In 2025, the range ran from \$324.16 per hour to \$554.42 per hour, with a median of \$443.64 per hour. CforAT requested a rate of \$390/hour for Ms. Woodford in 2025 (while inadvertently failing to provide this justification), which would have placed her between the low and median rate for a Level IV Public Policy Analyst. While the additional year of experience might support an increase from that prior request, CforAT again requests a rate of \$390 per hour for Ms. Woodford. This rate remains between the low and median level for a person of her experience and training.

³ Attachments not attached to final Decision

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments *(CPUC completes)*

Item	Reason

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?	
---	--

If so:

Party	Reason for Opposition	CPUC Discussion

B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	
--	--

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion

(Green items to be completed by Intervenor)

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. **CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY** [has/has not] made a substantial contribution to **D.26-07-007**.
2. The requested hourly rates for **CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY**'s representatives [, as adjusted herein,] are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses [, as adjusted herein,] are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$_____.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, [satisfies/fails to satisfy] all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. **CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY** is awarded \$_____.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, _____ shall pay **CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY** the total award. [for multiple utilities: “Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, ^, ^, and ^ shall pay **CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY** their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional [industry type, for example, electric] revenues for the ^ calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. If such data are unavailable, the most recent [industry type, for example, 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 [date], the 75th day after the filing of **CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY**’s request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today’s decision [is/is not] waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	
Contribution Decision(s):	D.26-07-007		
Proceeding(s):	A.25-06-022 et al.		
Author:			
Payer(s):			

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY	9/3/2026	\$ 37,356.50		N/A	

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$ 755	2025	
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$ 780	2026	
Rachel	Sweetnam	Attorney	\$ 275	2025	
Kate	Woodford	Analyst	\$ 300	2025	
Kate	Woodford	Analyst	\$390	2026	

(END OF APPENDIX)