

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Advance Demand
Flexibility Through Electric Rates

Rulemaking 22-07-005
(Filed July 14, 2022)

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO SIERRA CLUB FOR SUBSTANTIAL
CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION (D.) 25-08-049**

Intervenor: Sierra Club	For contribution to Decision (D.) 25-08-049
Claimed: \$35,092.50	Awarded: \$24,957.75
Assigned Commissioner: John Reynolds	Assigned ALJs: Carolyn Sisto

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	In D. 25-08-049, the Commission adopted guidelines for Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE), and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) (collectively, “Large IOUs”) to develop demand flexible (“DF”) rates that comply with the California Energy Commission’s Load Management Standards and advance grid reliability, affordability, and equity. The Decision provides guidance on incorporating marginal energy, generation, distribution, and transmission capacity costs into DR rates; defines processes for load-serving-entity participation and customer protections, and directs the IOUs to file applications for DF rate proposals within 60-90 days of issuance.
--	---

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:	September 16, 2022	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:	October 17, 2022	NOI filed date was on October 17, 2022, no other specified date of NOI was discovered in docket records. Sierra Club incorrectly filled the NOI filed date in this section.
3. Date NOI filed:	Yes	10/17/2022
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
Showing of eligible customer status (§ 1802(b)) or eligible local government entity status (§§ 1802(d), 1802.4):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	Application (A.) 21-12-009	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	5/18/2022	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		Yes
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.21-12-009	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	5/18/2022	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		

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

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.25-08-049	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	8/29/2025	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	10/27/2025	10/24/2025
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
1	On October 17, 2022, Sierra Club timely filed a Notice of Intent to Claim Intervenor Compensation. <i>See</i> Sierra Club Notice of Intent (Oct. 17, 2022), <i>available at</i> https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M497/K733/497733194.PDF . The California Public Utilities Commission (“Commission”) has not yet ruled on Sierra Club’s Notice.	Verified

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (see § 1802(j), § 1803(a), 1803.1(a) and D.98-04-059):

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
1. Marginal Energy Costs in DF Rate Proposals Sierra Club supported the use of marginal energy costs using the CAISO Day-Ahead prices at the DLAP <i>See Working Group Report</i> at 16 (Oct. 11, 2023).	“It is reasonable to require the Large IOUs to use CAISO’s day-ahead energy market price at DLAPs as the MEC in DF Rate Proposals to comply with the CEC LMS and effectively incentivize customer load shifting.” D. 25-08-049 at 138, Conclusion of Law 2.	Verified
2. Marginal Generation Capacity Cost (MGCC)	“... [W]e agree with CLECA that MGCCs in DF Rate Proposals must reflect long-run marginal costs	Verified

<p>Sierra Club opposed the exclusion of long-run MGCC in DF rates as non-compliant with the CEC’s Load Management Standards. <i>Working Group Report at 158-59</i>. Sierra Club further objected to the inclusion of a “distribution congestion adjustment” in DF rates due to equity impacts. <i>Working Group Report at 156</i>.</p>	<p>because this approach: (1) sends a strong DF signal and aligns with long-standing Commission practice and rate design principles, (2) ensures that the DF price accurately incorporates scarcity costs for available generation capacity, (3) improves the accuracy of the scarcity price signal that promotes long-term cost savings through improved grid utilization and efficiency, and (4) incentivizes customer behavior that can reduce future generation capacity-related costs.” Decision 25-08-049 at 40-41.</p> <p>“Microgrid RC proposes to exclude long-run marginal costs in MGCCs and instead provide capacity contracts to individual customers for firm forward commitments. We believe, however, that dispatch features that provide capacity contracts would require significant administrative overhead and are not proven to be based on cost causation. Further, Microgrid RC’s proposal would not be compliant with the CEC Load Management Standard that requires MGCCs to be included in DF rates. We also share Sierra Club’s and Cal Advocates’ concern that Microgrid RC’s proposal to include a Distribution Congestion Adjustment in DF rates would unfairly assign electricity costs to customers in low-income neighborhoods where congestion on distribution networks may occur. For these reasons, we reject Microgrid RC’s proposal.” Decision 25-08-049 at 41.</p> <p>“We reject Microgrid RC’s Distribution Congestion Adjustment proposal because it is based solely</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>on a customer’s location on the distribution system and could result in significantly different annual revenue recovery (or annual \$/kWh rate) and bill impacts for customers[.]” <i>Id.</i> at 61.</p>	
<p>3. Marginal Transmission Capacity Cost (MTCC)</p> <p>Sierra Club supported eventual inclusion of transmission costs into the DF rate design and recommended that the Joint IOUs should expeditiously request approval from FERC for CPUC jurisdiction over transmission costs so that these can be included in DF rates. <i>Working Group Report</i> at 47 (Oct. 11, 2023); <i>Sierra Club and 350 Bay Area Joint Reply Comments on Track B Report</i> at 5-6 (Dec. 21, 2023).</p>	<p>“Accordingly, we provide the following guidance to the Large IOUs on MTCC design: Large IOUs are encouraged to meet and confer to develop a plan to design MTCC price components that complement MGCC and MDCC price components that will be included in DF Rate Proposals. We direct the Large IOUs to describe their plan to design MTCC price components that will be incorporated in DF Rate Proposals, either in supplemental testimony in existing applications, or in any new applications.” D. 25-08-049 at 67.</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>4. Marginal Distribution Capacity Costs (MDCC)</p> <p>Sierra Club supported “an average distribution value” to address equity and implementation obstacles for location-based distribution pricing. <i>Working Group Report</i> at 87.</p>	<p>While the Commission directed the Large IOUs to include hourly and location-based distribution costs, the Commission acknowledged Sierra Club’s perspective and “recognize[d] that operational complexities, addressing equity concerns, and the need for additional data collection and analysis may prevent the Joint IOUs from initially implementing highly granular circuit-specific distribution pricing.” D. 25-08-049 at 59-60. Accordingly, the Commission recommended that the IOUs either use “(1) aggregate</p>	<p>Verified</p>

	<p>loads at the substation-level or (2) PG&E’s circuit-clustering approach referenced in the Joint IOU proposal, which calibrates prices to recover the same annual revenues as customers’ Otherwise Applicable Tariff, to set MDCCs.” <i>Id.</i> at 60.</p>	
<p>5. Non-Marginal Costs</p> <p>Sierra Club argued that the Commission should reject the use of multipliers for the non-marginal distribution capacity cost and instead direct the IOUs to develop revenue-neutral adders to make the distribution rate in each time-of-use period revenue-neutral to the base rate. <i>See Sierra Club Opening Comments on ALJ Ruling</i> at 1-2 (May 22, 2024)</p>	<p>“... it is reasonable to provide the IOUs with two options for recovering non-marginal costs in import DF Rate Proposals: (1) using an EPMC scalar applied to time-varying marginal prices, or (2) using a time-differentiated Revenue Neutral Adder.” D. 25-08-049 at 79, 141-142 (Conclusion of Law 19).</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>6. Low-income participation and technology funding</p> <p>Sierra Club argued that in order for residential customers to maximize the benefits of dynamic pricing, those customers require enabling technology and education. Sierra Club recommended that the Commission direct the IOUs to match dynamic rate programs with incentives and education and marketing. Sierra Club</p>	<p>“[I]t is reasonable to direct the Large IOUs to modify the evaluation of PG&E and SCE’s Expanded DF Pilots, authorized in D.24-01-032, to understand how low-income and DAC customers, including residential customers in multi-unit dwellings and non-residential customers, can increase their enrollment, enhance their usage behavior (<i>i.e.</i> conservation or load shifting), reduce bill impacts, and experience bill savings from DF rate programs. As stated by the Joint IOUs, the results of this evaluation</p>	<p>Verified</p>

<p>recommended that the Commission leverage existing dynamic rate pilots to study the impact on DAC communities. Sierra Club did not recommend that DF rates be added to the scope of the CBO Arrearages Case Management Pilot. <i>See Working Group Report</i> (Oct. 11, 2023) at 34, 99, 167-68; <i>Sierra Club and 350 Bay Area Joint Reply Comments on Track B Report</i> (Dec. 21, 2023); <i>Sierra Club Opening Comments on ALJ Ruling</i> at 3-4 (May 22, 2024)</p>	<p>can be leveraged by SDG&E for its own consideration of how DF rate programs can be tailored to serve the needs of low-income customers (i.e. ME&O, technology incentives, and DF rate design to promote customer understanding).” D. 25-08-049 at 129.</p> <p>“It should be noted that no parties that responded to the April 2024 Ruling questions pertaining to equity and access strongly supported the notion of a new study focused on the needs of low-income customers. Parties argue for such needs to be studied in a more cost-effective manner, including in existing dynamic rate pilots [citing Sierra Club’s comments]. We thus believe it is reasonable to adopt Cal Advocates’ suggestion that the Large IOUs should leverage the evaluations embedded within the current PG&E and SCE Expanded Pilots (which include evaluations of ESJ communities) to study of equity and access of low-income and DAC customers to DF rates.” <i>Id.</i> at 129-30.</p> <p>“The CBO study is not appropriate for the purpose of understanding the needs of low-income customers regarding dynamic rates as the study is not focused on low-income customers or their response to dynamic rates.” <i>Id.</i> at 131-32.</p>	
<p>7. CCA Participation in DF Rates</p> <p>Sierra Club recommended that the IOUs work with CCAs on implementation and that CCAs should have the option to use bundled</p>	<p>“It is reasonable that each LSE should have the ability to offer DF rates based on the characteristics of its customer base (i.e. income, DER ownership, etc.) and resource</p>	<p>Verified</p>

<p>generation rate for their customers or develop their own generation rate. Sierra Club also recommended that the delivery rate for IOUs and CCAs in DF rates should be uniform. <i>Working Group Report</i> (Oct. 11, 2023) at 35, 101.</p>	<p>portfolio, and that both bundled and unbundled customers include a uniform delivery component in DF rates, as it would ensure that delivery charges for different customer types and LSEs are similar . . . Moreover, it is reasonable for LSEs to have the option to develop their own dynamic generation rate. However, if LSEs adopt an incumbent Large IOU’s dynamic generation rate, they are advised to set this rate based on an analysis of relevant data (<i>i.e.</i> generation costs, customer sales, and marginal energy prices at CAISO Pricing Nodes). Given the Joint IOUs’ pledge to collaborate with LSEs to develop LSE DF rates, the IOUs’ DF Rate Proposals should provide detailed proposals about this process.” D.25-08-049 at 136.</p>	
---	---	--

B. Duplication of Effort (§ 1801.3(f) and § 1802.5):

	Intervenor’s Assertion	CPUC Discussion
<p>a. Was the Public Advocate’s Office of the Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding?</p>	Yes	Verified
<p>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</p>	Yes	Verified
<p>c. If so, provide name of other parties: 350 Bay Area; CalCCA; SEIA</p>		Verified
<p>d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication: Sierra Club coordinated with 350 Bay Area to avoid duplication and further supported and/or built upon recommendations from organizations such as CalCCA and SEIA to limit the number of issues before the Commission. Further, Sierra Club focused on low-income access and equitable rate design that was distinct from the participation of other parties, including Cal Advocates.</p>		Noted

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

	CPUC Discussion
<p>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness: Sierra Club’s participation in this proceeding had a significant impact on the ultimate decision. The Commission agreed with several of Sierra Club’s recommendations. Sierra Club’s participation in the Working Group further supported the development of the three proposals before the Commission.</p> <p>Sierra Club’s participation was also strategically tailored so as not to spend unnecessary time and resources to achieve the desired result. Sierra Club’s expert consultant attended Working Group meetings on behalf of Sierra Club, and effectively advised Sierra Club on key areas of consideration. Sierra Club then submitted pointed and concise comments, only submitting comments when deemed necessary to advance Sierra Club’s interests. As a result, the total costs claimed are relatively small, especially compared to the benefits that ratepayers could achieve through effective implementation of DF rates.</p>	Noted
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>Sierra Club strategically participated in this proceeding by submitting comments at opportune times and limiting its comments to areas in which Sierra Club could bring value to the Commission. Sierra Club focused its participation in the Working Group, hiring an expert consultant to participate and help advise Sierra Club, so that Sierra Club’s participation could focus on building consensus and providing the Commission with actionable recommendations. Moreover, Sierra Club voluntarily removed hours that were spent on positions that were not adopted by the Commission as well as certain administrative hours, such as time spent reviewing Commission orders. Accordingly, Sierra Club is submitting a relatively small number of hours for intervenor compensation.</p>	Noted
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Marginal Costs - 28.7 (32.95%) 2) Non-Marginal Costs - 17.35 (19.92%) 3) Customer Protections/Participation - 26.25 (30.14%) 4) CCA Participation - 1.75 (2.01%) 	Noted

	CPUC Discussion
5) General Participation - 7.75 (8.90%) 6) Intervenor Compensation Claim - 5.3 (6.08%)	

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Rose Monahan	2023	21.1	375	D.24-02-042 (Comment 1)	\$7,912.50	21.1	\$375 [1]	\$7,912.50
Rose Monahan	2024	1.7	410	D.25-07-032 (Comment 1)	\$697.00	1.7	\$410 [2]	\$697.00
John Wilson	2023	59	430	D.24-02-042 (Comment 2)	\$25,370.00	35.4 [3]	\$430 [4, 6]	\$15,222
<i>Subtotal: \$33,979.50</i>						<i>Subtotal: \$23,831.50</i>		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Rose Monahan	2025	5.3	210.00 [5]	Resolution ALJ-393 (Comment 1)	\$1,113.00	5.3	\$212.50 [5]	\$1,126.25
<i>Subtotal: \$1,113.00</i>						<i>Subtotal: \$1,126.25</i>		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$35,092.50						TOTAL AWARD: \$24,957.75		

*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

ATTORNEY INFORMATION			
Attorney	Date Admitted to	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?)

CLAIMED			CPUC AWARD
	CA BAR ²		If "Yes", attach explanation
Rose Monahan	1/4/2020	329861	No

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III³:

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Attachment 1	Certificate of Service
Attachment 2	Timesheets
Attachment 3	Task Order between John Wilson and Sierra Club demonstrating that Mr. Wilson represented Sierra Club on a contingency fee basis for the demand flexible rates working groups.
Comment 1	<p>Sierra Club requests an hourly rate of \$375 for 2023, \$410 for 2024, and \$445 for 2025 for Rose Monahan. Ms. Monahan has been practicing law since 2015. Ms. Monahan received a B.A. from Pennsylvania State University in 2012, and her J.D. from American University, Washington College of Law in 2015. Ms. Monahan is an active member in good standing of both the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (ID No. 322807) and the state of California. She was first admitted to the Maryland bar in December 2015 (ID No. 1512160126) and is currently on inactive status. After law school, Ms. Monahan clerked for the Honorable J. Michael Wachs of the Maryland Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County. She then was an attorney with an environmental nonprofit in Pennsylvania, representing individuals on a wide range of environmental and energy matters. Since joining Sierra Club in 2018, Ms. Monahan has represented Sierra Club in public utility litigation and other proceedings in Arizona, Oregon, Idaho, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.</p> <p>The requested rates for Ms. Monahan are based on the Hourly Rate Chart adopted in Resolution ALJ-393, which places her at Level III for attorneys with 5-10 years of experience. The requested rate for 2023 was approved in D. 24-02-042, and the requested rate for 2024 was approved in D.25-07-032. Sierra Club requests an hourly rate of \$425 for 2025, which was calculated by multiplying Ms. Monahan's previously approved 2024 rate 4.07% and rounding to the nearest \$5.00, per Resolution ALJ-393. Ms. Monahan's 2025 rate only applies for purposes of claim preparation, for which Sierra Club proposes a rate of \$210, representing half of Ms.</p>

² This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

³ Attachments not included in final Decision.

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	<p>Monahan’s proposed 2025 rate, rounded to the nearest \$5.00.</p> <p>Ms. Monahan’s timesheet is included in Attachment 2.</p>
<p>Comment 2</p>	<p>Sierra Club requests an hourly rate of \$430 for 2023 for John Wilson. Mr. Wilson is a public policy expert with a Master of Public Policy from Harvard University, 1990, and a Bachelor of Arts in Physics from Rice University, 1992. He has worked as an expert, consultant, and analyst since 1992 – a period of over 28 years – and has exceptionally strong credentials. For 12 years, from 2007-2019, Mr. Wilson was the Deputy Director for Regulatory Policy, Southern Alliance for Clean Energy where he managed regulatory policy, including supervision of experts in areas of energy efficiency, renewable energy, and market data, provided expert witness testimony on a broad range of public policy and utility matters, including rate design, resource planning, renewable energy, energy efficiency, and resource procurement, and directed litigation activities. In 2019 he joined Resource Insight, Inc. as its Research Director, where he worked as a policy expert on a wide range of utility matters, including for Sierra Club in Commission proceedings. Mr. Wilson transitioned to Grid Strategies in 2023, where he continues to work as an expert on utility matters related to energy and rate design. Mr. Wilson has submitted expert testimony in numerous Public Utility Commission dockets. Additionally, Mr. Wilson is the author or co-author of over 55 publications, reports, and presentations dealing with utility and energy issues. The requested rate for work performed in 2023 was approved in D.24-02-042.</p> <p>Mr. Wilson represented Sierra Club in Working Groups 1 and 2 on a contingency basis, wherein Mr. Wilson agreed to delay compensation if and until compensation was awarded through the Commission’s intervenor compensation program.</p> <p>Mr. Wilson’s timesheet is included in Attachment 2.</p>

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
<p>[1] Rose Monahan 2023 Hourly Rate</p>	<p>Sierra Club requests an hourly rate of \$375 for work conducted by Rose Monahan in 2023. D.24-02-042 established a 2023 rate of \$375 for Rose Monahan therefore we adopt this approved rate for Rose Monahan.</p>
<p>[2] Rose Monahan 2024 Hourly</p>	<p>Sierra Club requests an hourly rate of \$410 for work conducted by Rose Monahan in 2024. D.25-07-032 established a 2024 rate of \$410 for Rose Monahan therefore we adopt this approved rate for Rose Monahan.</p>

Item	Reason
Rate	
<p>[3] Reduction of hours for John Wilson in 2023</p>	<p><u>Excessive Hours</u></p> <p>John Wilson claimed a total of 59.0 hours in 2023, however, 55.0 hours were designated for participation in Working Group 1 (WG1) and Working Group 2 (WG2) activities in R.22-07-005. A review of John Wilson’s time records shows that a substantial portion of these hours—nearly weekly two-hour entries between January and July 2023—are described only as “WG1 meeting,” “WG2 meeting,” or “WG1 call,” with no indication of preparation, follow-up work, or deliverables resulting from those sessions. The descriptions are vague and repetitive, and do not specify distinct contributions or analysis produced for the record.</p> <p>While these work group participation activities are meant to be helpful to the decision making process, the number of hours claimed is excessive relative to their impact. Excessive is when the Commission determines that the time claimed is disproportionate to the reasonable amount of effort required for that contribution. It is also not clear how Wilson’s participation contributed to the process, other than mere attendance. Furthermore, the burden of proof is on the intervenor to show that each of the hours claimed was spent productively making a substantial contribution to the decision. In this instance Sierra Club failed to prove that.</p> <p>Accordingly, we find it reasonable to reduce John Wilson’s total claimed hours by 40 percent to account for the vagueness of the working-group time entries and the excessiveness of repetitive meeting attendance. Applying this adjustment results in a reduction of 29.50 hours (40 % × 59 hours), leaving 35.40 approved hours.</p>
<p>[4] John Wilson 2023 Hourly Rate</p>	<p>Sierra Club has confirmed that Mr. John Wilson is a consultant. Pursuant to Commission policy, the rate requested by an intervenor must not exceed the rate billed to that intervenor by any outside consultant it hires, even if the consultant’s billed rate is below the floor for a given experience level⁴. Per the IComp Program Guide at 24, the Commission may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award (§ 1804(d)).</p> <p>Based on the supplemental information Sierra Club provided, Sierra Club has confirmed that that per the terms of their contract, Mr. John Wilson has been hired on a contingency basis, where the consultant has not billed or collected compensation for the work performed until the final award is given. Given this contingency, we therefore utilize the reasonable rates</p>

⁴ D.07-01-009, D.08-04-010, and ALJ Resolution ALJ 235.

Item	Reason
	<p>established by Resolution ALJ-393 based on Mr. John Wilson’s experience.</p> <p>Sierra Club requested a 2023 hourly rate of \$430.00 for Mr. John Wilson. Given the 2023 Expert – Public Policy Analyst IV rate range is \$293.26 to \$523.52 with a median of \$402.74, we find the 2023 hourly rate of \$430 to be reasonable and we adopt it here.</p> <p>The award made herein for the consultant’s contribution shall be passed through in full to the consultant and no portion of this part of the award shall be kept by the intervenor. Additionally, the rates approved here are specific to work in this proceeding and the contract terms between the consultant and intervenor, as they are established in accordance with the Commission’s policy on consultant compensation, and the understanding that the consultant has not billed or collected compensation for the work performed until the final award is given.</p>
<p>[5] Rose Monahan 2025 Hourly Rate</p>	<p>Sierra Club requests an hourly rate of \$425 for Rose Monahan in 2025 in the role of Legal - Attorney - Level III. For Rose Monahan’s 2025 hourly rate, the Commission applies the annual escalation methodology adopted in Resolution ALJ-393, which is a percent change of 3.46%, not 4.07%. With a 2024 rate of \$410 previously established for Monahan, and based on the escalation factor of 3.46%, a 2025 rate of \$424.19 is calculated. We round the calculated rate to the nearest \$5, therefore we adopt the hourly rate of \$425 for Rose Monahan in 2025.</p> <p>The correct claim preparation rate is \$212.50, calculated as half of the already rounded <u>already rounded</u> \$425 hourly rate. Sierra Club’s request of \$210 was a miscalculation, since the \$425 rate had already been rounded and should not be rounded again.</p>
<p>[6] Consultant Rates</p>	<p>The Commission takes this opportunity to remind all intervenors that they bear the burden of providing accurate, complete, and honest information in all compensation requests. The Commission relies on intervenors' good faith representations, particularly regarding consultant agreements and payments, as it does not have the resources to review every contract or non-standard arrangement in detail.</p> <p>Intervenor compensation is funded by ratepayers, and the Commission takes seriously any effort to mislead or obscure the financial basis for a claim. Although no violation of Rule 1.1 has been found in this instance, we remind intervenors that under Rule 1.1, intent to deceive is not required for a violation, misstatements may still be actionable. Dishonest or misleading claims not only risk denial of compensation but may also subject the intervenor to penalties.</p> <p>The Commission has clear authority to audit intervenors' books and records</p>

Item	Reason
	to verify the basis for any award. Intervenors must therefore ensure full transparency regarding actual time spent on issues, consultant fees, payment arrangements, and the actual disbursement of funds. Failure to meet this obligation undermines the integrity of the compensation process and may lead to denial of claims or further enforcement action.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS
Within 30 days after service of this Claim, Commission Staff
or any other party may file a response to the Claim (see § 1804(c))

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	No
---	----

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

Although the 30-day comment period was waived, the Administrative Law Judge issued a ruling on March 13, 2026, permitting party comments and reply comments to the Proposed Decision. Comments were filed and served by Sierra Club on March 12, 2026, as Attachment A, to their motion.

<u>Party</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>CPUC Discussion</u>
--------------	----------------	------------------------

<p><u>Sierra Club</u></p>	<p><u>Sierra Club objects to the Commission’s reduction to consultant John Wilson’s time by 40%. Sierra Club argues the PD does not take into account that the working groups in which Sierra Club’s consultant participated were directed by the Scoping Memo issued on November 2, 2022, in order to address Track B issues.</u></p> <p><u>Additionally, the PD does not acknowledge that Sierra Club cited to the Working Group Report seven times in documenting Sierra Club’s claimed contributions. These citations are demonstrable proof of Sierra Club’s consultant’s active and engaged participation in the working groups and how that participation translated into positions advocated by Sierra Club that were ultimately adopted by the Commission and helped to inform the Commission’s final order.</u></p> <p><u>Lastly, Sierra Club argues the PD does not acknowledge that timesheets identified the amount of time its consultant spent during each working group meeting by issue, providing context for how the consultant’s attendance translated to the issues in this proceeding. The PD does not address this additional context and information, and, thus, its proposal to reduce Sierra Club’s consultant’s time by 40% is arbitrary.</u></p>	<p><u>Per the IComp guide and rules, it is the intervenors’ responsibility to submit clear, detailed, and specific time records. Timesheets must identify the issues worked on, actual time spent, applicable hourly rates, and costs claimed, without requiring further clarification or context. In this instance, Sierra Club does not clearly demonstrate how Wilson’s participation contributed to the decision-making process, other than mere attendance.</u></p> <p><u>Accordingly, the Commission upholds the original disallowances, as outlined in Part III.D (CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments) of the Proposed Decision. No changes are made to the disallowed hours.</u></p>
---------------------------	--	---

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Sierra Club has made a substantial contribution to D.25-08-049.
2. The requested hourly rates for Intervenor’s representatives are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services, and/or reflect the actual rates billed to, and paid by the intervenor, for consultant services rendered.
3. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$24,957.75.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. Sierra Club is awarded \$24,957.75.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc., Liberty Utilities, and PacifiCorp shall pay Sierra Club their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2023 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. If such data is unavailable, the most recent electric revenue data shall be used. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning January 7, 2026, the 75th day after the filing of Sierra Club's request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.
4. [Rulemaking 22-07-005 is closed.](#)

This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at ~~Sacramento~~ San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2508049		
Proceeding(s):	R2207005		
Author:	ALJ Carolyn Sisto		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc., Liberty Utilities, and PacifiCorp		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Sierra Club	10/27/2025	\$35,092.50	\$24,957.75	N/A	See Part III D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments.

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Rose	Monahan	Attorney	375	2023	\$375
Rose	Monahan	Attorney	410	2024	\$410
Rose	Monahan	Attorney	425	2025	\$425
John	Wilson	Consultant	430	2023	\$430

(END OF APPENDIX)

Summary report: Litera Compare for Word 11.6.0.100 Document comparison done on 4/7/2026 1:42:31 PM	
Style name: Default Style	
Intelligent Table Comparison: Active	
Original filename: Original R.22-07-005 Sierra Club IComp PD 04-09 Agenda.docx	
Modified filename: (REV.1) R.22-07-005 Sierra Club IComp PD 04-09 Agenda.docx	
Changes:	
<u>Add</u>	11
Delete	6
Move From	0
<u>Move To</u>	0
<u>Table Insert</u>	1
Table Delete	0
<u>Table moves to</u>	0
Table moves from	0
Embedded Graphics (Visio, ChemDraw, Images etc.)	0
Embedded Excel	0
Format changes	0
Total Changes:	18