



FILED

10/07/26

04:59 PM

R1812006

ATTACHMENT A

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Continue
the Development of Rates and Infrastructure
for Vehicle Electrification

R.18-12-006

DECLARATION OF GREGORY MORRIS

I, Gregory Morris, declare as follows:

1. I am the Director of the Green Power Institute (GPI), the renewable energy program of the Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security (Pacific Institute). I have held that position since GPI was created as a program of the Pacific Institute in 1995. I make this declaration in support of GPI's Application for Rehearing of D.26-09-021. The matters stated here are within my personal knowledge, except those stated on the basis of information and belief, which I believe to be true, and if called as a witness I could and would testify competently to them.
2. I hold a B.A. in Natural Science from the University of Pennsylvania, an M.Sc. in Biochemistry from the University of Toronto, and a Ph.D. in Energy and Resources from the University of California, Berkeley. I have worked as a renewable energy analyst and consultant for more than 40 years. I have participated in proceedings before this Commission on behalf of GPI since 2003.

GPI's participation in R.18-12-006

3. GPI was an active party in R.18-12-006 throughout its tenure. On behalf of GPI I, together with GPI Senior Associate Tam Hunt and consultant Michael Chiacos,

- reviewed the parties' filings, propounded and analyzed discovery, participated in workshops, and filed comments and reply comments on the issues in the scoping memo and on the proposed decision that became D.22-11-040.
4. Our work was verified in D.26-09-021 without qualification as providing all of the Substantial Contributions claimed in our IComp claim.
 5. When GPI was asked in Spring 2024 for a copy of an invoice showing Mr. Chiacos' charge rates for 2021 and 2022 we filed one on May 9, 2024. The invoice was for work done in an associated Application – we sent that one with Commission blessing because it was a single invoice that covered hours in both 2021 and 2022. No additional information was requested on behalf of Mr. Chiacos' participation in this proceeding.

GPI's compensation history before the Commission

6. I have maintained records of every intervenor compensation claim GPI has filed with the Commission, and every decision the Commission has issued on those claims. I maintain a spreadsheet that is contemporaneously updated when IComp Award Decisions are rendered.
7. From January 2004 through the end of 2023, the Commission decided 74 GPI intervenor compensation claims. Those claims sought \$5,992,567 in the aggregate, and the Commission awarded \$5,509,222, or approximately 92 percent of the amounts requested. During those twenty years, no GPI claim was awarded less than 60 percent of the amount requested. Those claims were decided by scores of different Administrative Law Judges and under five Commission presidents.
8. On September 3, 2026, the Commission adopted thirteen decisions on GPI compensation claims, including D.26-09-021. Those thirteen claims sought \$1,836,539 in the aggregate. The Commission awarded \$706,200, or approximately 38 percent of the amounts requested.

9. The proposed decisions on all thirteen claims were issued on July 8, 2026, on the same day, with the same deadline for comments. They were authored by at least nine different Administrative Law Judges in twelve different proceedings. Notwithstanding that, the thirteen decisions contain substantial amounts of identical text, including:

All of the 13 Decisions, in Part 3D, include an identical summation of GPI's submissions in response to the Sept. 16, 2025, Ruling requesting additional information on all of our pending IComp claims.

All of the 13 Decisions include the following admonition: "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 unclear information regarding consultant terms, missing invoices, or errors throughout. This resulted in inefficient use of the intervenor's own time and an undue burden on Commission staff resources to reconcile these omissions. 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 efficiently for all participants."

The hours claimed for IComp claim preparation are characterized as "unreasonable and excessive given the scope of issues and overall scale of the request," or in nearly identical language in the twelve Decisions that cut these hours, including D.26-09-021.

10. Between summer 2024 and Sept. 3, 2026, the Commission issued no decision on any GPI compensation claim. GPI received no notice that its claims would not be decided during that period, and to this date no explanation has been given of the reason for the moratorium. Two of GPI's claims were 3½ years old, and GPI held 8 of the oldest 9 pending claims on the Commission's spreadsheet prior to Sept. 3, 2026. GPI made numerous inquiries to the intervenor compensation program, and to at least 8 advisors to all of the Commissioners over the past year-and-a-half about the hold-up but received virtually no information.

What did not change

11. GPI's practitioners and their circumstances did not change between the period in which its claims were receiving awards at approximately 92 percent of requests,

and the period covered by the thirteen decisions adopted on Sept. 3. I have been GPI's Director and principal technical practitioner throughout this period. Mr. Hunt has worked on GPI's Commission matters since 2011. Mr. Chiacos has worked with GPI since 2016.

12. GPI's timekeeping practices did not change. GPI's practitioners have at all times kept contemporaneous time records identifying the date, the hours, and the work performed, and I have at all times reviewed those records before a claim is filed and excluded hours I judged not to be reasonable or productive.
13. The form of GPI's claims did not change. GPI has used the Commission's claim form as issued, allocated its hours by issue, identified its claimed contributions with citations to the final decision and to GPI's pleadings, and attached its time records.
14. The character of GPI's advocacy did not change. In its prior claims, as in this one, GPI proposed alternatives that the Commission sometimes adopted and sometimes rejected; advanced positions that other parties also advanced; responded to rulings inviting party proposals; and briefed issues that the Commission ultimately did not reach.
15. GPI's organizational arrangements did not change in any respect that the Commission had not previously reviewed. GPI has at all times described itself as a program of the Pacific Institute and not as a separate entity. The arrangements among the Pacific Institute, Future Resources Associates, and GPI's practitioners were in place during the period in which the Commission awarded GPI approximately 92 percent of its claims. When the Commission requested documentation of those arrangements in September 2025, GPI provided it on time and in full detail.

GPI's reliance

16. GPI undertook and continued its participation in R.18-12-006 in reliance on the Commission's consistent practice of compensating GPI for participation of the

- kind described above. Had GPI understood that the Commission would evaluate its participation under the standards applied in D.26-09-021, GPI would have made different decisions about the scope of its participation, including whether to prepare and submit a tariff proposal and how extensively to participate on issues where other parties were also active.
17. GPI received no notice, before it performed the work at issue in this claim, that the Commission's standards for evaluating compensation claims had changed or would change. I am not aware of any resolution, rulemaking, ruling, or decision issued before GPI performed that work announcing any such change.
 18. GPI has no endowment, membership dues, or other general operating revenue that funds its participation in Commission proceedings. Intervenor compensation awards are the source of payment for that work. GPI engaged its practitioners on the understanding, based on the Commission's practice, that awards would be made in the ordinary course and in amounts consistent with GPI's history.
 19. GPI's practitioners performed the work in this proceeding on a deferred-payment basis, with payment contingent in whole or in part on receipt of an intervenor compensation award. Those obligations were incurred as the work was performed and cannot now be unwound. The work itself cannot be undone.
 20. As a consequence of the non-payment of GPI's claims for the past two years, GPI exhausted its funds and was forced to suspend its participation in Commission proceedings. The Commission's actions have been contrary to our reliance rights, and have clearly and severely injured the Green Power Institute's operations.

Claim preparation

21. Preparation of GPI's compensation claim in this proceeding required review of D.22-11-040, a decision of approximately 250 pages, against GPI's pleadings and participation over the course of Track 5; preparation of the issue-by-issue showing of claimed contributions in Part II of the claim form, with citations to the

decision and to GPI's pleadings; allocation of GPI's hours among the four issues; and assembly of the time records of three practitioners.


22. My contemporaneous time records reflect 28.00 hours devoted to preparation of this claim. GPI claimed 16.00 of those hours. I excluded 12.00 hours in the exercise of billing judgment before the claim was filed.
23. GPI did not claim any hours for preparing its October 6, 2025, response to the Commission's September 16, 2025, ruling requesting supplemental information, or for our comments on the July 8, 2026, PD in this proceeding, and we will not make any claim for the hours spent preparing this Application for Rehearing.

Rates

24. My role, experience, and the nature of the work I perform in Commission proceedings did not change between the periods covered by D.22-06-041, D.23-11-036, and D.24-04-036 and the period covered by this claim. I am not just a program administrator – I am a fully engaged practitioner. I perform technical and policy analysis, prepare and review pleadings, participate in workshops and discovery, and appear on GPI's behalf in Commission proceedings, as I have for more than twenty years.
25. The arrangement under which my fees are deferred pending an intervenor compensation award was in place during the periods covered by D.22-06-041, D.23-11-036, and D.24-04-036.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on October 7, 2026, at Berkeley, California.



Gregg Morris
Director, The Green Power Institute