



Decision _____

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

18/01/26

09:56 AM

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Update Rules for the Safety, Reliability, and Resiliency of Electrical Distribution Systems.

Rulemaking 24-05-023
R2405023
(Filed May 30, 2024)

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY AND DECISION ON INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY

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 lcompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov.

Intervenor: CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY (CforAT)	For contribution to Decision (D.) 26-08-007
Claimed: \$ 48,482.50	Awarded: \$
Assigned Commissioner: Matthew Baker	Assigned ALJ(s): Colin Rizzo
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:	/S/ Melissa W. Kasnitz
Date: October 2, 2026	Submitted by: Melissa W. Kasnitz

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

A. Brief description of Decision:	Decision 26-08-007 (the Final Decision) adopts a Template & Customer Reliability Schema to transparently report reliability information that complies with the Commission's practices and enhances the safety, reliability, and resilience of the distribution grid. It also establishes a process for the IOUs to submit data along with an annual customer reliability report, and closes the proceeding.
--	---

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:	None held, see comment below.	
2. Other specified date for NOI:	See comment below	
3. Date NOI filed:	8/22/2024	
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:	At the time this proceeding was opened, CforAT's then-current ruling was issued in R.22-11-013	
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	March 15, 2024	
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.22-11-013	
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	March 15, 2024	
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.26-08-007	
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	8/14/2026	
15. File date of compensation request:	10/2/2026	

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

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		

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

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
	No Prehearing Conference was held in this proceeding. CforAT noted in our NOI that no Prehearing Conference had been held or set in this proceeding and no scoping memo had yet been issued. In the initial Order Instituting Rulemaking that initiated this docket, the proceeding was given a preliminary categorization as quasi-legislative. The OIR also stated in Ordering Paragraph 10 that any party that expected to claim intervenor compensation must file its NOI within 30 days of the filing of reply comments on the OIR. Reply comments were filed on July 23, 2024. Ordering Paragraph 10 of the OIR further stated that a party may file an NOI within 30 days of a prehearing conference if one was held and cited Rule 17.1(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Rule 17.1(a)(2) states that, in a quasi-legislative proceeding in which a prehearing conference is not held in advance of the issuance of a scoping memo, a party may file an NOI at any time until 30 days after the issuance of the scoping memo. Rule 17.1(a)(1) states that a party may file an NOI within 30 days after a prehearing conference in any proceeding in which a prehearing conference is held. Under either of these provisions, as well as the direct order in the OIR, this NOI was timely filed.	

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion

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
Background and Overview: This proceeding was originally opened as a broad rulemaking docket intended to consider changes to existing policies, procedures, and rules regarding the safety, reliability and resiliency of electrical distribution systems. Its initial formal scope stated an intent to first develop processes for how the investor-owned utilities (IOUs) would collect and aggregate data to establish a foundation for measuring utility outages. It also indicated an intent to consider short term and long term issues of transparency, reliability, and prioritization of reliability investments. Scoping Memo at pp. 1-3. However, the only portion of the intended scope where the Commission provided a detailed list of issues and established a clear schedule concerned definitions, data collection and reporting. Scoping Memo at pp. 3-5.	This overview is intended to provide context for CforAT's direct contributions and our participation in the proceeding. Specific information about our contributions to the relevant decision is set forth in detail below.	

Subsequently, the Commission requested draft data reporting proposals from the respondent IOUs as well as other stakeholders and then modified the schedule of activities to direct the Joint IOUs to develop and submit a draft Customer Reliability Report Template that met parameters set forth in the associated ruling, and invited party comments in response to the draft. Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Modifying Track 1 Schedule of Activities, issued on August 22, 2025. The Commission subsequently issued a Proposed Decision Adopting Unified Investor-Owned Utility Customer Reliability Report, which was revised and adopted as D.26-07-008 following party comment. This Final Decision closed the proceeding without addressing the additional short and long-term issues that were identified in the initial Scoping Memo. CforAT's was an active participant in all aspects of the proceeding that resulted in the adoption of the reliability reporting template. CforAT's formally filed contributions in the proceeding include the following: • CforAT Reply Comments on OIR, filed on July 23, 2024;		
---	--	--

• CforAT Response to Ruling Requesting Proposals (Proposal Comments), filed on December 13, 2024; • CforAT Opening Comments on Proposed Report Template (Opening Comments), filed January 9, 2026; • CforAT Reply Comments on Proposed Template (Reply Comments), filed on January 26, 2026; • CforAT Comments on Template PD, filed on July 30, 2026; • CforAT Reply Comments on Template PD, filed on August 4, 2026.		
Scope and Inclusion of Issues Related to De-Energization (PSPS) and Fast Trip: CforAT asserted the importance of obtaining data on all outages, including those caused by de-energization and by Fast Trip, as customers face harms from outages related to these processes. Reply Comments on OIR at pp. 4-6; Proposal Comments at pp. 6-8.	Neither Fast Trip outages nor de-energization were mentioned in the OIR, including its preliminary scope of issues. However, they were raised as topics to be addressed in the ALJ’s Ruling Requesting Draft Proposals from Respondents and Stakeholders, issued on November 12, 2024 at p. 8, and subsequently incorporated the draft Customer Reliability Report Template that was the basis of the Template PD and the Final Decision.	
Narrative Reporting Requirements: CforAT argued that the reporting template should provide separate explanations for customer notifications before types of events, including planned events, de-energization events, and other outages. CforAT Opening	The Final Decision states: “We agree with CforAT that the that the Joint IOUs must explain in the template how they communicate with customers during an outage. This includes separate explanations for communications practices around different types of outages, including planned maintenance	

Comments at p. 4, cited in Final Decision at p. 14. <i>See also</i> CforAT Comments on Template PD at pp. 2-3. CforAT argued that IOUs should discuss communications with Public Safety Partners separately from their discussion of general customer notifications. CforAT Opening Comments at pp. 4, 6, cited in Final Decision at p. 14. <i>See also</i> CforAT Comments on Template PD at pp. 2-3.	outages, public safety power shutoff (PSPS) outages, weather-related outages, Fast-Trip outages, and unplanned outages due to other causes.” Final Decision at p. 16, citing to CforAT Opening Comments at p. 4. “The Joint IOUs must also include separate discussions of communications with public safety partners as well as the specific communication and outreach to the most vulnerable customer groups, including those with medical needs, who are impacted by an outage.” Final Decision at p. 16, citing to CforAT Opening Comments at p. 4.	
Definitions – Customers with Medical Needs: CforAT argued that IOUs should be required to separately identify and provide data on customers with medical needs in all reporting, rather than only include them as part of the broader population of customers with access and functional needs (AFN). CforAT specifically recommended that the definition of customers with medical needs should include all households enrolled in the medical baseline program or receiving a medical discount, as well as all customers who have self-identified as a household that includes a person with a medical condition, as authorized in R.18-12-005. CforAT Opening Comments at pp. 5-6, cited in the Final Decision at pp. 17-18. <i>See also</i> CforAT Comments on Template PD at	The Final Decision adopts CforAT’s recommended definition of customers with medical needs. Final Decision at p. 19. It also requires the IOUs “to report data on the notification to customers before, during, and after outage events, and detail notification efforts made to public safety partners and customers with medical needs during all outages.” Final Decision at p. 17. This definition was not included in the initial proposed decision, but was added in the revision issued following party comments on the PD. Proposed Decision Rev. 1 (Redline) at p. 19. The Final Decision also requires the IOUs to separately include counts for AFN, Medical Baseline (MBL) and essential customers for each recorded outage. Final Decision at p. 25.	

pp. 4-5; CforAT Reply Comments on Template PD at p. 3. CforAT also addressed the importance of addressing and reporting impacts of outages on this population in initial comments on the ruling requesting draft proposals. CforAT Proposal Comments at pp. 2-3.		
Definition: Unplanned Outages CforAT argued that the Commission should not classify deliberate de-energization by a utility (PSPS) as an “unplanned outage.” CforAT Opening Comments at p. 3; CforAT Reply Comments at pp. 4-5; CforAT Comments on Template PD at pp. 5-6; CforAT Reply Comments on Template PD at pp. 3-4.	While the Final Decision does not directly cite to CforAT’s input, it acknowledges the inappropriateness of classifying PSPS events as “unplanned outages” and requires separate reporting on these events. Final Decision at p. 21.	
Customer Reliability Reporting: CforAT, along with other advocates, recommended that de-energization events (PSPS outages) and Fast-Trip events need to be handled separately from other outages. CforAT Reply Comments at p. 3, cited in Final Decision at p. 25.	The Final Decision requires the IOUs to separately report whether an outage is a PSPS or an outage on a circuit or segment where Fast-Trip was enabled. Final Decision at pp. 25-26. It continues by stating: “We agree with Cal Advocates and CforAT that the status of a customer at a given location should be clearly and accurately recorded at the time of the outage so that an AFN or MBL customer is represented in the template. Furthermore, we agree with Cal Advocates and CforAT that PSPS events need to be categorized separately from other outage types or the risks caused by these events will obscure the scope of events. Customer status associated with a meter is not static. For	

	example, a customer may become AFN or MBL or the customer may move to different addresses. As a result, the requirements we adopt here will help accurately capture customer status on a per-event basis.” Final Decision at p. 26.	
Report Cadence and Update: CforAT recommended that the IOU reports should be provided twice a year to minimize the delay between an event and the report on the event. CforAT Opening Comments at p. 8, cited in the Final Decision at p. 28. <i>See also</i> CforAT Comments on Template PD at pp. 3-4; CforAT Reply Comments on Template PD at pp. 2-3. CforAT also recommended that the Commission should provide an opportunity for all stakeholders, not just the IOUs, to seek updates to the Report Template to ensure that it remains useful over time. CforAT Comments on Template PD at pp. 3, 7; CforAT Reply Comments on Template PD at pp. 4-5. Finally, CforAT recommended that the proceeding remain open to allow for follow-up activity including long-term actions identified in the OIR as well as any needed corrective action. CforAT Comments on Template PD at pp. 1-2; CforAT Reply Comments on Template PD at pp. 1-2.	While multiple non-IOU parties recommended reporting more frequently than once per year, the Final Decision authorizes annual reporting. Final Decision at p. 28. However, it also requires quarterly updated data submissions “to align with the annual customer reliability report.” Final Decision at p. 29. This quarterly requirement was added to the initial Proposed Decision following party comment on the PD. <i>See</i> Proposed Decision, Rev. 1 (Redline) at pp. 2-3 and p. 29. The Final Decision states that “This approach strikes a balance between providing the Commission with critical information that will actually produce useful outcomes against ordering duplicative or burdensome requirements that strain limited resources without providing meaningful insight into reliability conditions.” <i>Id.</i> The fact that the Commission modified the initial annual requirement from the PD (which had no additional quarterly supplement) and that it characterized its conclusion as striking a balance between the IOUs’ preference for a single annual report and other party recommendations for more frequent reporting shows that the input from CforAT (as well as other non-IOU parties) contributed to the Commission’s decision-making process on this issue. While CforAT is not	

	expressly cited, this contribution supports an award of compensation. Finally, while the Commission declined to keep the proceeding open, the Final Decision includes a requirement for the IOUs to hold a workshop with Commission staff and stakeholders in 2027 “to identify opportunities for clarification, implementation challenges, reporting limitations, data quality improvements, and other enhancements that would benefit future reporting cycles. This engagement will provide the opportunity to make improvements, promote continuous refinement of the reporting framework, and reduce the need for more significant revisions in future years.” Proposed Decision, Rev. 1 (Redline) at p. 31. It is reasonable to presume that this addition was included in response to input from CforAT and other stakeholders about the need for an opportunity to address the effectiveness of the reporting mechanism and otherwise follow up on the requirements of this 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	
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Various positions taken by CforAT were similar to those of other non-IOU parties, including Cal Advocates and Joint Local Governments.		
d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication: At all times in this proceeding, CforAT represented the unique perspective of utility customers with disabilities who are at heightened risk of harm		

during power outages. CforAT’s constituency is highly dependent on the availability of reliable energy 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. As an example of CforAT’s direct representation of the needs of our constituency, we note that we were the leading advocates addressing the inclusion of customers with medical needs in the reporting template. 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 issues under review. CforAT coordinated as appropriate with 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

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 all forms of power outages on our unique constituency of customers who depend on reliable supplies of electricity to maintain their health and safety. 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 consideration of system reliability. Even so, the importance of the issues under consideration in this	

	CPUC Discussion
proceeding is high for all customers and even greater for CforAT's constituency of customers with disabilities and medical needs. 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 overwhelmingly performed by Legal Director Melissa W. Kasnitz. Ms. Kasnitz is an experienced practitioner with substantial expertise in addressing issues of concern to CforAT's constituency of customers with disabilities and medical needs. Her work is efficient and effective, and at all times was focused on responding to the concerns of the Commission on pending issues and addressing the specific needs of CforAT's constituency. In support of Ms. Kasnitz, CforAT's junior attorney, Rachel Sweentam performed a small number of tasks, including attendance at a workshop where Ms. Kasnitz was unavailable and preparation of reply comments on the proposed decision that resulted in D.26-08-007. Delegation of such tasks, with appropriate review and oversight, is appropriate.	
c. Allocation of hours by issue: As discussed above, the work in this proceeding overwhelmingly focused on development of a reporting template, as the other issues identified in the Scoping Memo were not subsequently addressed. Because this issue occupied the overwhelming portion of the proceeding, it also shows as the leading issue where work was completed. Kasnitz Time – 2024 (20.6 hours total) General Participation: 11.4 hours (55%) 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 Order Instituting Rulemaking and work done prior to the issuance of the Scoping Memo, including the identification of issues and areas of focus for the ongoing proceeding. Proposals: (9.2 hours) (45%) The issue area "Proposals" includes time spent addressing the Commission's ruling (issued on November 12, 2024) inviting parties to prepare data definition and guideline proposals. These proposals, which were also considered in two workshops, informed the subsequent development of the reporting template that was adopted in the Final Decision.	

	CPUC Discussion
Kasnitz Time - 2025 (13.9 hours total) General Participation: 2.0 hours (14%) Proposals: 7.5 hours (54%) Template: 4.4 hours (32%) The issue area “Template” includes all work addressing the proposed draft template, beginning with the ruling requiring its development (issued on August 22, 2025) and continuing with party input and through the release of the final template in the Final Decision. Sweetnam Time - 2025 (4.0 hours total) Proposals: 4.0 hours (100%) Kasnitz Time – 2026 (19.0 hours) Template: 19.0 hours (100%) Sweetnam Time – 2026 (9.4 hours) Template: 9.4 hours (100%)	

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hour s	Rate \$	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2024	20.6	\$ 735	D.24-10-028	\$ 15,141.00			
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2025	13.9	\$ 755	D.25-10-060	\$ 10,494.50			
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2026	19.0	\$ 780	D. 26-07-022	\$ 14,820.00			
Rachel Sweetnam	2025	4.0	\$ 275	D.25-10-050	\$ 1,100.00			
Rachel Sweetnam	2026	9.4	\$ 300	See comment below	\$ 2,820.00			

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
<i>Subtotal: \$ 44,375.50</i>						<i>Subtotal: \$</i>		
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 \$
<i>Subtotal: \$</i>						<i>Subtotal: \$</i>		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2024	1.2	\$ 367.50	1/2 standard rate	\$ 441.00			
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2026	9.4	\$ 390.00	1/2 standard rate	\$ 3,666.00			
<i>Subtotal: \$4,107.00</i>						<i>Subtotal: \$</i>		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
1.								
2.								
<i>Subtotal: \$</i>						<i>Subtotal: \$</i>		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$ 48,482.50						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. 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								

CLAIMED			CPUC AWARD
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
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	Detailed Time Records
	Sweetnam Rate – 2026: CforAT has previously requested a rate of \$300 per hour for Ms. Sweetnam based on application of the Commission’s escalation rate from her approved 2025 rate of \$275 per hour plus an authorized step increase of 5%. CforAT’s justification for this proposed rate is provided in full in multiple pending compensation request filed earlier this year, including a pending request in A.24-10-006 (Verizon/Frontier), among others. In these pending requests, CforAT identifies Ms. Sweetnam as an Attorney Level II, with a step increase available. We note that the Commission previously issued D.26-08-028, a compensation order for CforAT’s contributions in R.20-08-021 (CASF OIR). This compensation order includes consideration of time spent on compensation work by Ms. Sweetnam that took place very early in 2026. Because all merits work in that proceeding was complete in 2025, CforAT did not request 2026 rates for work on the compensation request. However, in the compensation order, the Commission applied the 2026 COLA to establish a 2026 rate of \$285 per hour for Ms. Sweetnam, and then ordered compensation at half of that rate for time spent on compensation issues in 2026. CforAT appreciates that staff conducted this calculation, but we respectfully request that it not treat that determination of Ms. Sweetnam’s rate as final, and that instead it should consider the application of the requested step increase as appropriate for Ms. Sweetnam’s substantive work in 2026

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

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.26-08-007.
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.26-08-007		
Proceeding(s):	R.24-05-023		
Author:			
Payer(s):			

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY	October 2, 2026	\$ 48,482.50		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	\$ 735	2024	
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$ 755	2025	
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$ 780	2026	
Rachel	Sweetnam	Attorney	\$ 275	2025	
Rachel	Sweetnam	Attorney	\$ 300	2026	

(END OF APPENDIX)