

Decision 26-04-019 April 9, 2026

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Recovery of Recorded Expenditures Related to Wildfire Mitigation, Catastrophic Events, and Other Recorded Costs. (U39M)

Application 22-12-009
(Filed December 15, 2022)

DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION (D.) 25-09-008

Intervenor: The Utility Reform Network (“TURN”)	For contribution to Decision (D.) 25-09-008
Claimed: \$246,912.50	Awarded: \$246,912.50
Assigned Commissioner: John Reynolds	Assigned ALJ: Camille Watts-Zagha

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	Decision 25-09-008 addressed rate recovery issues in the reasonableness review application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) for 2021 wildfire mitigation, vegetation management, catastrophic events, and other costs recorded in memorandum and balancing accounts. It disallowed rate recovery of \$217 million of the \$349 million of Enhanced Vegetation Management (EVM) program costs included in PG&E’s request, the sole category of cost recovery TURN addressed in this proceeding. The decision also found that PG&E had reasonably incurred all of its requested 2021 Wildfire Mitigation Balancing Account (WMBA) costs, and adopted an uncontested settlement addressing costs in several memorandum accounts.
--	---

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:	3/27/2023	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	N/A
3. Date NOI filed:	April 24, 2023	Verified
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:	See Comment 1, below.	A.21-12-007
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	See Comment 1, below	5/31/2022
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	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.21-12-007	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	May 31, 2022	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	N/A
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.25-09-008	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	9/26/2025	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	11/21/2025	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

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

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
1	TURN did not receive an affirmative ruling on its Notice of Intent in this proceeding. As explained in the Commission’s Intervenor Compensation guide, “normally, an ALJ Ruling need not be issued unless: (a) the NOI has requested a finding of “significant financial hardship” under § 1802(g). (b) the NOI is deficient; or (c) the ALJ desires to provide guidance on specific issues of the NOI.” (page 12) Since none of these factors apply to the NOI submitted in this proceeding, there was no need for an ALJ ruling in response to TURN’s NOI.	Noted

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
<p><u>Adoption of \$217 Million Disallowance of Costs of Enhanced Vegetation Management (EVM) Program</u></p> <p>PG&E’s WMCE reasonableness review application requested recovery of \$814.7 million in 2021 vegetation management (VM) program costs that had been recorded in its VM Balancing Account (VMBA). Approximately \$350 million of the total VM amount was for PG&E’s Enhanced VM program.</p> <p>TURN raised a number of challenges to the reasonableness of the spending associated with that program, and proposed a disallowance of the full \$350 million PG&E requested. TURN also presented an alternative recommendation of a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.25-09-008, pp. 2, and 19-20. • Ex. TURN-1 (Testimony of Eric Borden), pp. 5-22. 	<p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p>

<p>disallowance of \$234 million. TURN’s testimony and briefs challenged PG&E’s decision-making process leading up to the approval of the 2021 Enhanced VM program, as well as PG&E’s implementation and administration of the program. TURN also focused on the utility’s “new guidance” issued in October of 2021 that resulted in far more trees being removed rather than trimmed. In addition, TURN challenged PG&E’s contentions that the incurred costs were tied to the utility’s need to comply with the Commission’s oversight and enforcement process.</p> <p>The Commission adopted a disallowance of \$217 million, a figure just below TURN’s alternative recommendation. The decision cites in particular the impact of the new tree removal directive issued in October 2021, and the substantial increases in the average per tree costs indicated by the recorded amounts for November and December 2021. Consistent with TURN’s position, the Commission also rejected PG&E’s suggestion that costs driven by PG&E’s new focus on tree removal were prudent because they stemmed from PG&E’s response to the Commission’s oversight and enforcement process.</p> <p>The Commission calculated the disallowance in a different manner than that underlying TURN’s alternative recommendation, but focused on the same period (the last quarter</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TURN Opening Brief, pp. 3-17. • TURN Opening Brief, pp. 17-21. • D.25-09-008, pp. 20-30 and FOF 15 and COL 3. • <i>Id.</i>, pp. 26 and 27 and FOF 4-5 and 14-15 and COL 3. • <i>Id.</i>, p. 30 and FOF 6-13. 	<p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p>
--	--	--

<p>of 2021) and reached a similar conclusion about the amount reasonable for recovery (disallowance of \$217 million rather than TURN’s alternative recommendation of \$234 million). In reaching its conclusions, the Commission favorably cited TURN-supplied record evidence presented through its testimony attachments, hearing exhibits, and cross-examination during evidentiary hearings.</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>	No	Verified
<p>c. If so, provide name of other parties: Cal Advocates and the Direct Access Customer Coalition (DACC) were both active parties in the proceeding. However, neither of those parties addressed Vegetation Management issues generally, or the Enhanced Vegetation Management issues specifically.</p>		Noted
<p>d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication:</p> <p>At the outset of this proceeding TURN coordinated with Cal Advocates to determine how the intervenors’ limited resources could most effectively be deployed in this proceeding. The upshot of this initial coordination effort was that TURN addressed issues associated with PG&E’s request for rate recovery of costs recorded in its VMBA (approximately \$814.7 million of the \$1,363.3 million total requested in this application – Ex. PG&E-1, Table 1-1), while Cal Advocates would cover the issues associated with the WMBA and the CEMA and other memorandum accounts. (Cal Advocates Opening Brief, p.</p>		Noted

<p>1, indicating that neither its prepared testimony or opening brief addressed VMBA issues.)</p> <p>Throughout the course of the proceeding, TURN further coordinated with the other intervenors in developing and advocating on various procedural matters such as timing and treatment of responses to the ALJ ruling of October 17, 2023 seeking additional information how PG&E records costs and assigns them to various accounts.</p> <p>The Commission should find that TURN’s participation was efficiently and effectively coordinated with the participation of other intervenors (Cal Advocates and DACC) so as to avoid undue duplication and to ensure that to the extent duplication occurred, it served to supplement, complement, or contribute to the showing of the other intervenor. And consistent with such a finding, the Commission should determine that all of TURN’s work is compensable consistent with the conditions set forth in Section 1802.5.</p>	
---	--

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

	CPUC Discussion
<p>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:</p> <p>TURN’s request for intervenor compensation seeks an award of approximately \$250,000 as the reasonable cost of our participation in this proceeding. This figure reflects a reduction of approximately \$55,000 for time devoted to TURN’s work in the interim rate recovery (IRR) issues addressed in D.23-06-004. TURN is not seeking intervenor compensation for that work.</p> <p>The \$250,000 requested here represents approximately one-tenth of 1% of the \$217 million EVM disallowance adopted in D.25-09-008. TURN submits that the costs that TURN has included in this request are reasonable in light of the effort undertaken to develop, present and defend the recommended disallowances associated with the EVM-related costs in 2021. The Commission should find that TURN's efforts have been productive and the requested amount of compensation is reasonable in light of the benefits achieved through those efforts.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>This Request for Compensation includes around 230 hours of TURN’s attorney time, the equivalent of around six weeks of full-time work for an individual attorney. It also includes approximately 120 hours of expert witnesses’ time. TURN’s testimony preparation effort in the proceeding</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	CPUC Discussion
<p>entailed significant data and information gathering efforts through discovery, extensive analysis of the EVM program and activities from several different perspectives (including PG&E’s internal decision-making process and wildfire risk reduction and cost effectiveness issues). Post testimony, TURN responded to discovery and participated in evidentiary hearings for which extensive cross-examination was conducted of both PG&E’s and TURN’s witnesses on EVM-related matters. In addition, TURN’s attorney devoted substantial time and effort to preparing TURN’s position and formal responses to the ALJ Ruling seeking additional information issued on October 17, 2023, shortly before the evidentiary hearings conducted in early November. TURN presented extensive and well-supported arguments in its opening and reply briefs, as well as a very limited number of hours supporting the Proposed Decision in 2025. The Commission should conclude that the total number of hours included here is very reasonable, particularly in light of the \$217 million disallowance of EVM program costs.</p> <p>TURN assigned this proceeding to Robert Finkelstein, the organization’s General Counsel, and he performed nearly all of the attorney work that is included in this request. Certain issues arose during the preparation of responses to PG&E’s data requests for which Hayley Goodson, TURN’s Managing Attorney, brought important information and perspective. Eric Borden of Synapse Energy Economics served as TURN’s analyst and expert witness sponsoring TURN’s testimony on EVM-related issues in the proceeding. TURN also includes a very small amount of time of Sylvie Ashford, TURN’s Energy and Climate Policy Analyst, devoted to assisting in the preparation of TURN’s comments on the Proposed Decision.</p> <p><u>Intervenor Compensation-Related Time</u></p> <p>TURN is requesting compensation for 8.5 hours devoted to compensation-related matters, the largest share of which is the 8.0 hours associated with Mr. Finkelstein’s preparation of this request for compensation. Given his extensive knowledge of all aspects of TURN’s participation in this proceeding and experience with preparing such requests, he was the most efficient choice to prepare this request for this proceeding.</p>	
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <p>TURN has allocated all of our staff time by issue or activity, as reflected in our attached timesheets (Attachment 2) and summary table showing the allocation of each attorney or analyst’s cumulative time by issue or activity code (Attachment 3). In this request TURN uses only one substantive issue</p>	<p>Noted</p>

			CPUC Discussion
<p>code, consistent with the focus of TURN’s participation in this proceeding on the Enhanced Vegetation Management (EVM) program. The activity codes reflect general activities that are part of nearly all CPUC proceedings, such as tasks associated with general participation, responding to discovery, and dealing with procedural matters such as responding to ALJ rulings.</p>			
Code	Description	Allocation of Time	
EVM	Work related to the analysis of PG&E’s EVM program operation and administration in 2021, and development of the proposed disallowances, including review of and responding to PG&E’s arguments regarding the tie-in of the EVM program and its various Wildfire Mitigation Plan (WMP) and Enhanced Oversight and Enforcement (EOE) initiatives.	69.0%	
IRR	Interim Rate Recovery – responding to PG&E motion for IRR, including coordinating with other intervenors on this issue, lobbying Commissioners’ advisors, and preparing comments on the proposed decision in mid-2023. *TURN does not include time coded IRR in this compensation request.	16.3%	
GP	General preparation not allocable to any specific issue, including initial review of application and supporting testimony, preparation of protest, and similar activities.	3.9%	
Disc	TURN’s attorney and expert witness time preparing responses to PG&E data request.	3.5%	
GH	General hearing participation work, such as developing exhibit lists, cross-examination estimates, and work on joint case management statements as required.	0.6%	
Coord	TURN’s attorney and expert witness time related to coordination with other parties.	0.6%	
Proc	TURN’s attorney time addressing procedural issues, here primarily the ALJ	4.3%	

			CPUC Discussion
	Ruling Seeking Responses to Questions issued on 10/17/23		
Settle	Limited time recorded for initial settlement meeting of parties and attending settlement conference	0.2%	
PD	Proposed Decision – Review of PD and preparation of comments on PD	1.6%	
<p><u>General Time Coded as “GP”</u></p> <p>Where work cannot be easily allocated to a specific issue or does not address a particular issue that TURN eventually addresses, but is essential to participation in litigation, TURN has historically used the general work designation “GP.” For example, reading Commission or ALJ Rulings typically falls into the “GP” code category, as those Rulings generally address procedural issues and/or multiple issue areas. Similarly, early review of testimonies to identify issues and preparation of the initial protest may be coded as GP. Other tasks, such as participating in mandatory status conferences, preparing joint case management-related documents at the ALJ’s request, and general hearing activities, may be coded with non-issue-specific activity codes such as “GH”.</p> <p>Based on direction from the Commission, TURN committed in 2023 to coding all time using individual issue codes as much as possible, and reducing the time coded to non-issue-specific activity and issue codes. As TURN’s timesheets show, it is impossible to entirely eliminate all work that is not specific to an identified issue in dispute, or to assign all work to a single issue. Nonetheless, the vast majority of TURN’s work included in this compensation claim pertained to the specific substantive issue areas TURN focused on here.</p>			

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Robert Finkelstein, General Counsel	2023	213.50	\$840.00	D.24-02-040	\$179,340.00	213.50	\$840.00 [1]	\$179,340.00

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
Robert Finkelstein	2025	5.25	\$905.00	Res. ALJ-393, 2024 rate plus 3.5% COLA; See Comment 1	\$4,751.25	5.25	\$905.00 [1]	\$4,751.25
Hayley Goodson, Managing Attorney	2023	6.25	\$625.00	D.24-02-040	\$3,906.25	6.25	\$625.00 [2]	\$3,906.25
Eric Borden, Synapse	2023	117.75	\$465.00	D.25-01-023; See Comment 2	\$54,753.75	117.75	\$465.00 [3]	\$54,753.75
Sylvie Ashford, Energy and Climate Policy Analyst	2025	1.25	\$265	Res. ALJ-393, 2024 rate plus 3.5% COLA plus 5% step increase; See Comment 3	\$331.25	1.25	\$265.00 [4]	\$331.25
Subtotal: \$243,082.50						Subtotal: \$243,082.50		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Robert Finkelstein, TURN General Counsel	2023	0.5	\$420	Half of 2023 Rate; D.24-02-040	\$210	0.5	\$420.00 [1]	\$210.00
Robert Finkelstein	2025	8	\$452.50	Half of Requested 2025 Rate	\$3,620	8.0	\$452.50 [1]	\$3,620.00
Subtotal: \$3,830						Subtotal: \$3,830.00		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$246,912.50						TOTAL AWARD: \$246,912.50		
<p>*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</p>								

CLAIMED		CPUC AWARD	
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
Robert Finkelstein	June 1990	146391	No
Hayley Goodson	December 2003	228535	No

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Attachment 1	Certificate of Service
Attachment 2	Timesheets for TURN’s Attorneys & Experts
Attachment 3	Time Allocation by Issue
Attachment 4	Support for Requested Hourly Rate for Consultant Eric Borden, Synapse Energy Economics
Comment 1	<p>2025 Hourly Rate for Robert Finkelstein</p> <p>TURN requests an hourly rate of \$905 for work conducted by TURN General Counsel Robert Finkelstein in 2025. The requested rate is equal to the rate authorized by the Commission in D.24-07-033 for Mr. Finkelstein’s work in 2024, \$875, adjusted by the 2025 escalation rate of 3.46%. Calculation: \$875 x [1.0346 (COLA)] = \$905.28, rounded to \$905.</p>
Comment 2	<p>2023 Hourly Rate for Eric Borden, Synapse Energy Economics</p> <p>TURN requests an hourly rate of \$465 for work conducted by Eric Borden in 2023. This rate is equal to Mr. Borden’s 2022 authorized rate of \$445 (D.23-05-032), adjusted by the Commission’s 2023 escalation rate of 4.5% (Res. ALJ-393). This is also the rate charged by Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. to TURN for Mr. Borden’s work in this matter.</p>
Comment 3	<p>2025 Hourly Rate for Sylvie Ashford</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>TURN requests that the Commission adopt a 2025 hourly rate of \$265 for TURN Energy Policy Analyst Sylvie Ashford. This rate is equal to the rate authorized by the Commission in D.25-06-030 for Ms. Ashford’s work in 2024, \$245, adjusted by both (1) the annual escalation rate of 3.46% for 2025 and (2) the first 5% step increase for Ms. Ashford in the Public Policy Analyst – Level II experience tier. Calculation: $\\$245 \times [1.0346 \text{ (COLA)} + 0.05 \text{ (step increase)}] = \\265.73, rounded to \$265.</p>

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
<p>[1] Robert Finkelstein 2023 and 2025 Hourly Rates</p>	<p>D.24-03-036 verified a 2023 hourly rate of \$840.00 as a Legal – Legal Director – V. We apply the same rate here.</p> <p>D.26-02-022 verified a 2024 hourly rate of \$875.00 as a Legal – Legal Director – V. Using our calculation methodology, based on the verified 2024 hourly rate of \$875.00, 2025 escalation factor of 3.46% and rounding to the nearest allowable \$5 increment:</p> <p>2025: $\\$875.00 \times 1.0346 = \\905.00</p> <p>We find the requested 2025 hourly rate of \$905.00 reasonable and adopt it here. Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation is rated at ½ preparer’s normal rate, bringing the 2025 claim preparation rate to \$452.50.</p>
<p>[2] Hayley Goodson 2023 Hourly Rate</p>	<p>D.24-02-040 verified a 2023 hourly rate of \$625.00 as a Legal – Attorney – V. We apply the same rate here.</p>
<p>[3] Eric Borden 2023 Hourly Rate</p>	<p>TURN has confirmed that Eric Borden 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>

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

Item	Reason
	<p>TURN has confirmed that it paid Eric Borden \$465.00 per hour for work in this proceeding. We find this rate reasonable given Eric Borden’s experience, and approve this rate here.</p> <p>The award determined herein for Eric Borden’s contribution in this proceeding shall be paid in full to Eric Borden, and no portion of this part of the award shall be kept by TURN. 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.</p>
<p>[4] Sylvie Ashford 2025 Hourly Rate</p>	<p>TURN requested a 2025 hourly rate of \$265.00 as an Expert – Public Policy Analyst - II. We note TURN’s requested hourly rate was based on the 2024 escalation rate of 3.46% and the first available step-increase as an Expert – Public Policy Analyst – II.</p> <p>D.25-06-030 verified a 2024 hourly rate of \$245.00 as an Expert – Public Policy Analyst – I. We apply the same rate here.</p> <p>Review of the submitted resume found 2+ years of relevant experience as a Public Policy Analyst, beginning with NRDC in September 2022, at the time of filing. We, therefore, find Sylvie Ashford qualifies as an Expert – Public Policy Analyst – II at the time of filing and adopt the new experience level for 2025. Per the Market Rate Study Hourly Rate Chart, the 2025 rate range for an Expert – Public Policy Analyst – II is \$204.98 to \$348.40, with a median of \$271.94. We find a 2025 rate of \$250.00 as an Expert – Public Policy Analyst – II reasonable and adopt it here.</p> <p>Additionally, TURN requested the first 5% step-increase as an Expert – Public Policy Analyst – II, therefore, we find the following:</p> <p>2025: $\\$250.00 \times 1.05 = \\265.00</p> <p>We find the 2025 hourly rate of \$265.00 for Sylvie Ashford as an Expert – Public Policy Analyst – II reasonable and adopt it here. We reiterate the adopted rate <i>includes</i> the first available step-increase in the <i>new</i> experience level of Public Policy Analyst – II.</p>
<p>[5] Intervenor Responsibility for Transparency and Accuracy in Compensation Requests</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>

Item	Reason
	<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 to verify the basis for any award. Intervenor 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</p>

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

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Utility Reform Network has made a substantial contribution to D.25-09-008.
2. The requested hourly rates for The Utility Reform Network’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 are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$246,912.50.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. The Utility Reform Network is awarded \$246,912.50.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall pay The Utility Reform Network the total award. 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 February 4, 2026, the 75th day after the filing of The Utility Reform Network's request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated April 9, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

JOHN REYNOLDS

President

DARCIE L. HOUCK

KAREN DOUGLAS

CHRISTINE HARADA

Commissioners

Commissioner Matthew Baker recused himself from this agenda item and was not part of the quorum in its consideration.

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:	D2604019	Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2509008		
Proceeding(s):	A2212009		
Author:	ALJ Watts-Zagha		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Utility Reform Network	November 21, 2025	\$246,912.50	\$246,912.50	N/A	N/A

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	\$840	2023	\$840.00
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	\$905	2025	\$905.00
Eric	Borden ⁵	Expert	\$465	2023	\$465.00
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	\$625	2023	\$625.00
Sylvie	Ashford	Expert ⁶	\$265	2025	\$265.00

(END OF APPENDIX)

⁵ Eric Borden served as a consultant in 2023.

⁶ Sylvie Ashford served as a consultant in 2025.