

Decision 26-05-030 May 14, 2026

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Establish Energization Timelines.

Rulemaking 24-01-018  
(Filed January 25, 2024)

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION (D.) 25-08-036**

<b>Intervenor:</b> The Utility Reform Network (TURN)	<b>For contribution to (D.) 25-08-036</b>
<b>Claimed:</b> \$289,380.00	<b>Awarded:</b> \$289,380.00
<b>Assigned Commissioner:</b> John Reynolds <sup>1</sup>	<b>Assigned ALJ:</b> Andrew Dugowson

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

<b>A. Brief description of Decision:</b>	In D.25-08-036, the Commission addressed Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s (PG&E’s) motion to revise the energization cost caps adopted in D.24-07-008 pursuant to SB 410. This decision denies the amounts requested by PG&E for 2025 and 2026 cap increases and grants lower amounts, increasing PG&E’s capital cost caps by \$456 million for 2025 and \$1,015.7 million for 2026. The Commission also approved PG&E’s request for inter-year flexibility between the 2025 and 2026 caps and eliminated the secondary annual revenue requirement caps, while maintaining that all recovered costs remain subject to refund pending reasonableness review in PG&E’s General Rate Case.
--	---

**B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812<sup>2</sup>:**

	<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>CPUC Verification</b>
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
<sup>1</sup> Date of Prehearing Conference:	N/A	
<sup>2</sup> All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.		

2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	Amended Scoping Ruling issued 10/18/2024 at page 7 states “parties seeking intervenor compensation related to this amended Scoping Memo that have not already filed a notice of intent (NOI) to claim intervenor compensation in R.24-01-018 to be authorized to file an NOI within 30 days of the issuance of this amended Scoping Memo.”
3. Date NOI filed:	11/18/2024	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
<b>Showing of eligible customer status (§ 1802(b)) or eligible local government entity status (§§ 1802(d), 1802.4):</b>		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.23-06-008	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	3/20/2024	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		Yes
<b>Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b)):</b>		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.23-06-008	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	3/20/2024	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
<b>Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b>		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.25-08-036	Verified

14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	9/4/2025	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	10/31/2025	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

**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):**

<b>Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)</b>	<b>Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
<p><b><u>1. Project Eligibility and 2026 Cost-Cap Reduction</u></b></p> <p>TURN argued that PG&amp;E’s forecast was unsupported by data and failed to account for the statutory timelines adopted in D.24-09-020 under Senate Bill 410. TURN recommended establishing an August 1, 2026 cutoff so that only projects capable of completion by December 31, 2026 would be eligible for inclusion in the ECNBIMA. TURN explained that this cutoff would reduce PG&amp;E’s 2026 forecast by about 4,660 projects, lowering the 2026 capital cost cap by approximately \$510 million. TURN also argued that distributed energy resource projects, such as solar and storage interconnections, are ineligible for recovery under Public Utilities Code Section 931(b) and should be excluded from the ECNBIMA.</p> <p>PG&amp;E and CUE opposed the cutoff, and PG&amp;E opposed TURN’s recommendation to remove DER projects from its forecast as part of its customer connection workload.</p> <p>The Commission agreed with TURN and found that projects with applications completed after August 1, 2026 were unlikely to be placed in service by December 31, 2026.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D.25-08-036, pp. 22-23.</li> <li>• D.25-08-036, pp. 47-49.</li> <li>• TURN Opening Brief (January 21, 2025) pp. 36-43.</li> <li>• D.25-08-036, pp. 8-14.</li> <li>• D.25-08-036, pp. 47-49.</li> <li>• D.25-08-036, pp. 47-49.</li> </ul>	<p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p>

<p>It limited eligibility to projects with completed applications on or before that date, reducing the 2026 forecast by 4,660 projects and the capital cost cap by \$510 million. The Commission also agreed that distributed energy resource projects are ineligible for recovery under Section 931(b) and directed PG&amp;E to exclude them from the ECNBIMA.</p>		
<p><b><u>2. Forecast Reasonableness and Cost-Cap Adjustments</u></b></p> <p>TURN argued that PG&amp;E’s proposed increases to the 2025 and 2026 cost caps were based on overstated demand growth in the MWC 16 cost category and cost escalation assumptions. TURN recommended applying a one-percent annual growth rate derived from historical trends and argued that PG&amp;E’s obligations under Senate Bill 410 and D.24-09-020 could be achieved within the existing funding levels authorized in D.24-07-008.</p> <p>PG&amp;E maintained that the higher funding levels were necessary to accelerate new-customer energizations, meet statutory targets, and address backlog projects.</p> <p>The Commission agreed with TURN that PG&amp;E had not presented adequate evidence to justify the requested increases and that its forecasts overstated the capital expenditures needed to meet statutory obligations. Thus, the Commission adopted a one-percent growth rate to adjust PG&amp;E’s forecasts and reduced the 2025 and 2026 cost caps by more than \$1.2 billion in total.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D.25-08-036, pp. 24-26.</li> <li>• TURN Opening Brief (January 21, 2025) pp. 9-16.</li>   <li>• D.25-08-036, pp. 9-10.</li> <li>• D.25-08-036, p. 58.</li>   <li>• D.25-08-036, pp. 57-58.</li> <li>• D.25-08-036, pp. 49-50.</li> </ul>	<p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p>
<p><b><u>3. Affordability</u></b></p> <p>TURN raised concerns about the impact of PG&amp;E’s request on affordability, stating that PG&amp;E’s assertion that the requested cost cap increase would increase average bundled rates by 1.8%. TURN noted that this misrepresents the full annual revenue requirement associated with the SB 410 cap by ignoring</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TURN’s reply brief, p. 5.</li> </ul>	<p>Verified</p>

<p>the \$295 million revenue requirement associated with the energization caps already approved in D.24-07-008.</p> <p>The Commission adopts this position, stating in Finding of Fact 45 that “PG&amp;E’s evidence does not support its claim that the rate impact of the full request in its motion is an increase of 1.8 percent for an average residential customer.”</p> <p>TURN also discusses the need to balance energization goals with affordability concerns, as the Commission previously did in D.24-07-008. Though the decision does not address this point in detail, it acknowledges the need for an affordability analysis, while deferring it to a future cost recovery proceeding.</p> <p>Based on extensive discovery, TURN also explained that PG&amp;E failed to provide evidence or analysis to support its claim that increased energization would lead to downward pressure on rates, disproving PG&amp;E’s claims throughout its motion that affordability impacts would be mitigated by such downward pressure on rates. TURN reviewed PG&amp;E’s analysis and identified several significant deficiencies, including the omission of incremental costs related to serving new customers beyond initial energization, the presentation of multiple energization scenarios that may not be cost-effective, and the inclusion of projects that connect distributed energy resources (DER) to the grid from its energization project forecasts.</p> <p>D.25-08-036 includes a lengthy discussion of this issue, and consistent with TURN’s position, finds that “[t]he bill impacts of the cost of energizing new customers based on our modifications to PG&amp;E’s motion in this decision, cannot be quantified without data related to the increased energy usage from</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. 25-08-036, Finding of Fact 45.</li> <li>• Opening brief p. 8, Reply brief at p. 15.</li> <li>• D. 25-08-036, pp. 56-57.</li> <li>• Opening brief pp.22-23</li> <li>• D. 25-08-036, at 55 (and surrounding discussion)</li> </ul>	<p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p>
--	--	---------------------------------

<p>completed energization projects,” And that “PG&amp;E’s motion and supporting documentation cannot adequately model the affordability impacts on customers.”</p>		
<p><b>4. Compliance with Past Decisions Requirements</b></p> <p><b>D.24-09-020</b>                  In response to PG&amp;E’s claims that it could not meet the required energization timelines, TURN argued that the Commission should affirm that PG&amp;E is required to comply with the energization targets and reporting required in D.24-09-020 regardless of receiving additional funding.</p> <p>The Commission agreed, including a finding of fact affirming “Nothing in this decision prevents PG&amp;E from complying with the targets and timelines adopted in D.24-09-020.”</p> <p><b>D.24-07-008</b>                  TURN evaluated PG&amp;E’s compliance with OP 28 and other requirements of D.24-07-008 that require PG&amp;E to provide new evidence to support any request to increase their cost caps. TURN noted that “PG&amp;E’s showing does not provide ‘new evidence supporting PG&amp;E’s accelerated scenario forecast’ sufficient to justify an increase to the annual cost caps.” Specifically, TURN found that, “PG&amp;E has not provided even preliminary data on most of the information identified in OP 28 or on the specific tracking and reporting requirements in D.24-07-008.”</p> <p>While the Commission does not adopt TURN’s position that PG&amp;E did not present sufficient new evidence, TURN contributed to the Commission’s deliberative process and TURN’s pleadings made sure the Commission had a robust record to assess the sufficiency of PG&amp;E’s showing and compliance with the Commission’s specified standard in D.24-07-008 for PG&amp;E to request</p>	<p>TURN Opening Brief, pp. 13-14.</p> <p>D. 25-08-036, p. 73, FOF 25.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TURN’s opening brief, p.12</li> <li>• D. 25-08-036, at pp. 45-46</li> </ul>	<p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p>

<p>an increase to the cost caps. D.25-08-036 acknowledges the requirements and assesses the sufficiency of PG&amp;E’s showing, demonstrating that TURN’s argument made a significant contribution to the Commission’s deliberation.</p>		
<p><b>5. Reporting/ Information for GRCs</b>                  TURN noted its appreciation for the work done by the auditor but noted that there is no basis for finding that the auditor will evaluate whether PG&amp;E’s spending is wasteful, if PG&amp;E should have pursued alternative approaches to completing the work, or if PG&amp;E was imprudent in its management of these projects and raised the fact that the existence of the auditor is not sufficient to prevent wasteful spending and that the Commission affirm the reasonableness and prudence of PG&amp;E’s spending will occur in the 2027 GRC.</p> <p>The Commission shared TURN’s concern and reiterated that it will review all costs in PG&amp;E’s 2027 GRC and that “PG&amp;E is expected to ensure that all amounts recovered through the interim memorandum account reflect prudent investment. If PG&amp;E does not provide evidence proving that the investments tracked in its interim memorandum account are prudent, the Commission will exercise its authority to disallow and require refund of any costs deemed unreasonable.”</p> <p>The Commission also directed PG&amp;E to provide a separate exhibit in its current GRC (A.25-05-009), supported by witness testimony that discusses how any costs tracked in the interim memorandum account were spent, which projects were completed, and summarizes the outcome of each audit of its interim memorandum account.</p>	<p>- TURN Reply Brief, pp. 15-16.</p> <p>- D. 25-08-036, pp. 66-67 &amp; 78 COL 8</p>	<p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p>

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

	<b>Intervenor’s Assertion</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
<b>a. Was the Public Advocate’s Office of the Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding?</b>	Yes.	Verified
<b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</b>	No.	Verified
<b>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</b>		
<b>d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication:</b>  <p>TURN coordinated with Cal Advocates throughout the proceeding to avoid duplicative efforts. Although TURN and Cal Advocates both recommended lower cost caps than PG&amp;E, the two parties conducted completely different analyses and arrived at different recommended caps. In evaluating the reasonableness of PG&amp;E’s proposed cap, TURN’s testimony focused on the extent to which the specific activities were appropriate to include in energization work forecasts, the reasonableness of PG&amp;E forecasts, including customer growth rates and ensuring that project eligibility and cost forecasting were consistent with statutory requirements under Senate Bill 410 and prior the Commission’s prior decision, D.24-07-008. TURN’s analysis also provided distinct quantitative and policy recommendations, including the August 1, 2026 cutoff for eligible projects, the one-percent forecast growth rate, and the exclusion of distributed energy resource projects under Public Utilities Code § 931(b). The Commission adopted many of TURN’s recommendations in D.25-08-036, reducing PG&amp;E’s 2026 capital cost cap by approximately \$510 million and lowering the overall cost authorizations for 2025 and 2026 by more than \$1.2 billion.</p> <p>The Commission should find that TURN’s participation was efficiently coordinated with the participation of Cal Advocates 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>		Noted

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**

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

	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
--	------------------------

<p><b>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:</b></p> <p>TURN’s request for intervenor compensation seeks an award of approximately \$289,000 as the reasonable cost of our participation in this proceeding. The Commission should conclude that the amount requested is reasonable under the circumstances here.</p> <p>D.25-08-036 addressed significant issues concerning PG&amp;E’s proposal to increase the 2025 and 2026 interim energization cost caps established in D.24-07-008 by over \$3 billion.</p> <p>As is more fully described in the substantial contribution section above, TURN’s participation in the proceeding was instrumental in evaluating eligibility of PG&amp;E’s forecasts for SB 410 interim cost recovery and reducing the annual cost recovery cap, thus reducing potential rate increases faced by PG&amp;E’s customers. The Commission agreed with TURN that PG&amp;E’s requested increases were not supported by adequate evidence and that its forecasts overstated the capital expenditures required to meet statutory energization obligations under Senate Bill 410. Consistent with TURN’s recommendations, the Commission adopted a one-percent forecast growth rate, established an August 1, 2026 cutoff for eligible projects, and excluded distributed energy resource projects under Public Utilities Code § 931(b).</p> <p>It is difficult to estimate with certainty the actual financial benefits to ratepayers from TURN’s participation because PG&amp;E may not record incremental customer energization costs up to the authorized ECNBIMA cap in any year. However, TURN’s participation supported the Commission’s determination to reduce PG&amp;E’s authorized capital cost caps by more than \$1.7 billion for 2025 and 2026 combined.</p> <p>As a result of TURN’s participation, the Commission also adopted limited PG&amp;E’s forecasts for interim cost recovery under SB 410 to only include projects capable of completion by December 31, 2026. The Decision also reinforced refundability and reasonableness-review safeguards to protect ratepayers from bearing premature or duplicative costs.</p> <p>TURN’s costs requested in this intervenor compensation claim -- less than \$289,000 – are reasonable in light of these strong cost controls and potential significant financial benefits to ratepayers. Ratepayers may also reap financial benefits from the cost caps encouraging PG&amp;E’s use of alternative funding sources or operational strategies to avoid the need for capacity upgrades while still complying with the energization timelines set in D.24-09-020.</p> <p>In light of these clear and very substantial potential financial benefits</p>	<p>Noted</p>
---	--------------

<p>coupled with the ratepayer benefits from improved oversight and transparency when these costs are reviewed in the GRC, the Commission should conclude that the requested amount of compensation is reasonable.</p>	
<p><b>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</b></p> <p>This Request for Compensation includes almost 490 hours of TURN’s attorney and expert time.</p> <p>TURN Senior Staff Attorney, Elise Torres, served as TURN’s primary attorney throughout the proceeding, with Senior Staff Attorney Matthew Freedman serving as TURN’s primary expert witness. Given the compressed schedule for this proceeding, the fact that PG&amp;E requested authorization for over \$3 billion in additional spending, and the myriad of important issues, TURN also retained a consultant to serve as an expert witness, Jessica Hetch, covering different issues than Mr. Freedman.</p> <p>Mr. Freedman generally took the lead on evaluating the activities PG&amp;E proposed to include in the new SB 410 ratemaking mechanism and the reasonableness of PG&amp;E’s forecasts. Mr. Freedman also covered PG&amp;E’s labor forecast and the inclusion of DER projects. Mr. Freedman took primary responsibility for drafting TURN’s testimony, briefs, and comments on the proposed decision on the these issues. Ms. Hecht generally took the lead on developing TURN’s positions related to the compliance with past decisions as well as the affordability of PG&amp;E’s proposed caps and associated policy implications. Ms. Hecht took primary responsibility for drafting TURN’s testimony on the these issues and worked with Ms. Torres to brief these issues.</p> <p>Consistent with her primary role as TURN’s attorney, Ms. Torres represented TURN in interactions with the Commission and other parties, including at the PHC, status conferences, and various meet and confers required by the ALJs. Ms. Torres took primary responsibility for drafting TURN’s response to PG&amp;E’s motion (with help and feedback from Ms. Goodson and assistance from Ms. Montoya), legal issues in the brief, and comments on the proposed decision related to compliance and affordability. Ms. Torres further advised Mr. Freedman and Ms. Hecht on testimony and oversaw the development of TURN’s positions. She guided the allocation of work responsibilities between Mr. Freedman and Ms. Hecht and coordination of TURN’s efforts across the small team, so as to allow TURN to efficiency examine and address as many issues as possible. Ms. Torres also provided strategic guidance related to responding to other parties’ briefs and comments, and otherwise ensuring that TURN’s participation in this proceeding would result in quality work product and assist the Commission in making its decision. Ms. Torres also oversaw Ms. Montoya’s work on discovery, the sections of the response to PG&amp;E’s</p>	<p>Noted</p>

motion that were assigned to her, and her drafting of TURN's motion for party status and motion to admit exhibits. Given Ms. Montoya's junior status and lower billing rate, it is reasonable for a senior attorney to oversee her work.

Isabella Montoya, TURN's Utility Justice Legal Fellow, who has a JD and Masters in Energy Regulation and Law, assisted Ms. Torres and Mr. Freedman with this proceeding including drafting data requests and reviewing responses and researching and drafting TURN's Response to PG&E's Motion to Increase its 2025 and 2026 Cost Caps. She also researched and drafted TURN's motion for party status and motion to admit exhibits.

This request also includes limited time (9.5 hours) for TURN Managing Attorney Hayley Goodson, who served as TURN's primary attorney in the proceeding addressing PG&E's first request for interim funding authorization for energization projects. Ms. Goodson primarily devoted time to this proceeding when PG&E's Motion to increase the cost caps was first filed and TURN's resources were already spread very thin due to other casework and Mr. Freedman was unavailable. Given the short period of time TURN had to prepare a response to the motion addressing many issues and requesting authorization to spend an addition \$3 billion, it was reasonable for Ms. Goodson to assist Ms. Torres with evaluating PG&E's motion and drafting the response, given her familiarity with PG&E's original request and D.24-07-008.

This request also includes limited time (3.5 hours) for TURN Energy and Climate Analyst, Sylvie Ashford, who analyzed a new argument raised in briefing by CUE regarding requirements for distribution capacity upgrade deferrals and drafted a response to CUE for the reply brief. Ms. Ashford is TURN's primary expert in the High DER proceeding (R.21-06-017), giving her the appropriate knowledge base and expertise to assess CUE's distribution capacity upgrade deferrals argument and respond.

This request also includes limited time (5 hours) for TURN paralegal, Reina Yanagiba who assisted TURN attorneys and experts with discovery.

This request for compensation includes time that the TURN team devoted to internal meetings to address issue coverage, division of labor, the development and evolution of TURN's recommendations, and strategy. Usually Ms. Torres, and Mr. Freedman participated in these meetings, during testimony development and briefing, Ms. Hecht participated in some meetings as well and TURN has included time for all participants in this claim. Because of the way TURN staffed this matter by necessity, each person needed to participate in these team meetings in order to share the results of their analysis and avoid internal duplication in the

<p>preparation of TURN’s testimony, briefs, and comments. Given these circumstances, TURN submits that this time was necessary to support the efficient development and presentation of TURN’s positions through testimony, briefing, and comments and does not reflect “internal duplication.” TURN also includes approximately 5 hours that TURN spent coordinating with Cal Advocates.</p> <p>TURN is also requesting compensation for 21.75 hours of intervenor compensation-related efforts associated with preparation of this request for compensation, primarily by Ms. Torres. 2 or the total hours are for Ms. Yanagiba’s drafting of Parts I and IV of the request for compensation. Ms. Montoya drafted TURN’s notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) and TURN is claiming more hours for preparing the NOI than may be typical, given that Ms. Montoya is new to the Commission’s iComp program requirements and preparing NOIs. Given Ms. Montoya's junior status and lower billing rate, it is reasonable for her to take longer to prepare a NOI than a more experienced TURN attorney would take.</p> <p>TURN suggests that the Commission should find that the number of issues addressed by TURN in this proceeding, the time necessary for preparing various pleadings, and TURN’s extensive testimony and briefing all warrant finding that the hours spent were reasonable. However, should the Commission believe that more information is needed or that a different approach to discussing the reasonableness of the requested hours is warranted here, TURN requests the opportunity to supplement this section of the request.</p>										
<p><b>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</b></p> <p>TURN has allocated all of our attorney and expert time by issue area or activity, as is evident on our attached timesheets (Attachment 2) and in Attachment 3, which shows the allocation of TURN’s time included in this request by attorney or expert and issue / activity area. The following codes relate to specific substantive issue and activity areas addressed by TURN.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="203 1465 1169 1881"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="203 1465 418 1549">Code</th> <th data-bbox="418 1465 930 1549">Description</th> <th data-bbox="930 1465 1169 1549">Allocation of Time</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="203 1549 418 1774">Cost Caps (Compliance)</td> <td data-bbox="418 1549 930 1774">Work related to compliance with the directives in D.24-07-008 and the energization timelines decision (D.24-09-020), and post decision compliance issues including the third party auditor and GRC reporting.</td> <td data-bbox="930 1549 1169 1774">6.43%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="203 1774 418 1881">Cost Caps (Proc)</td> <td data-bbox="418 1774 930 1881">Procedural work required by ALJs, including meet and confers, status conferences, PHCs, researching and</td> <td data-bbox="930 1774 1169 1881">5.56%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Code	Description	Allocation of Time	Cost Caps (Compliance)	Work related to compliance with the directives in D.24-07-008 and the energization timelines decision (D.24-09-020), and post decision compliance issues including the third party auditor and GRC reporting.	6.43%	Cost Caps (Proc)	Procedural work required by ALJs, including meet and confers, status conferences, PHCs, researching and	5.56%	<p style="text-align: center;">Noted</p>
Code	Description	Allocation of Time								
Cost Caps (Compliance)	Work related to compliance with the directives in D.24-07-008 and the energization timelines decision (D.24-09-020), and post decision compliance issues including the third party auditor and GRC reporting.	6.43%								
Cost Caps (Proc)	Procedural work required by ALJs, including meet and confers, status conferences, PHCs, researching and	5.56%								

	drafting comments on 9/25/24 ALJ Ruling, motion to admit exhibits & addressing issues with other parties' exhibits.		
Cost Caps (GP)	General participation related to the proceeding, such as reviewing PG&E's motion to raise the 2025 and 2026 cost caps, party testimonies, rulings on scope and schedule , researching and drafting the motion for party status.	11.58%	
Cost Caps (OP 28)	Work related to evaluating PG&E's compliance with OP 28 of D.24-07-008 regarding evidence to support any request to increase their cost caps.	4.54%	
Cost Caps (Coord)	Work related to external coordination with other parties to inform TURN's efficient and effective participation that was not specific to one of the major issue areas addressed by TURN.	1.58%	
Cost Caps (Response)	Researching and drafting response to PG&E Motion to revise 2025 and 2026 energization cost caps covering multiple issues or not easily allocated to specific issue areas.	4.08%	
Cost Caps (Forecasts)	Work related to determining cost forecasts eligibility for tracking in the SB 410 account and the interim cost recovery cap. Including issues with PG&E's cost forecasts, forecasts of new customer applications & MWC 16 work forecasting.	14.07%	
Cost Caps (Disc)	Work related to discovery, including the preparation and review of discovery documents, including responding to and analyzing data requests from other parties.	18.71%	
Cost Caps (Afford)	Work related to evaluating total costs, bill impacts, consistency with afford guidance from D.24-07-008 and PG&E's contribution to margin analysis and addressing these issues in the response to PG&E's motion to	9.59%	

	raise its cost caps, testimony and briefs.		
Cost Caps (Test)	Work related to developing TURN's testimony covering multiple issues or not easily allocated to specific major issue areas; also includes time spent reviewing and analyzing other parties' testimony, & PG&E's rebuttal testimony and taking notes for discovery and briefs.	6.22%	
Cost Caps (Cut Off)	Work related to the eligibility of post 2026 projects costs for tracking in the SB 410 account.	3.67%	
Cost Caps (DER)	Work related to evaluating the inclusion of DER projects in the cost caps and the impact of High DER decision on PG&E's request.	1.58%	
Cost Caps (Briefs)	Work related to briefing that was not specific to one of the major issue areas addressed by TURN in its testimony.	6.48%	
Cost Caps (PD)	Work related to reviewing and commenting on the proposed decision that preceded D.25-08-036, and reviewing other parties opening comments on the PD, not easily allocated to specific issue areas. Also includes limited time related to participating in ex parte meetings with Commission staff regarding the PD and developing materials for the meetings.	5.92%	

**B. Specific Claim:\***

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Elise Torres, TURN Attorney	2024	93.75	\$555.00	D.25-03-022	\$ 52,031.25	93.75	\$555.00 [1]	\$52,031.25
Elise Torres, TURN Attorney	2025	91.00	\$600.00	Res. ALJ-393, 2024 rate plus 3.46% COLA and additional increase for move to Attorney - Level IV experience tier. See Comment 1	\$54,600.00	91.00	\$600.00 [1]	\$54,600.00
Hayley Goodson, TURN Attorney	2024	9.50	\$680.00	D.24-09-017	\$6,460.00	9.50	\$680.00 [2]	\$6,460.00
Isabella Montoya, TURN Legal Fellow	2024	84.00	\$210.00	D.25-10-023	\$17,640.00	84.00	\$210.00 [3]	\$17,640.00
Isabella Montoya, TURN Legal Fellow	2025	8.75	\$230.00	Res. ALJ-393, 2024 rate plus 3.46% COLA and 5% step increase. See Comment 2	\$2,012.50	8.75	\$230.00 [3]	\$2,012.50

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
Matthew Freedman, TURN Attorney	2024	45.50	\$740.00	D.24-09-015	\$33,670.00	45.50	\$740.00 [4]	\$33,670.00
Matthew Freedman, TURN Attorney	2025	69.75	\$805.00	D.25-05-018	\$56,148.75	69.75	\$805.00 [4]	\$56,148.75
Reina Yanagiba, TURN Legal Assistant	2024	4.25	\$100.00	D.24-06-021	\$425.00	4.25	\$100.00 [5]	\$425.00
Reina Yanagiba, TURN Legal Assistant	2025	0.75	\$125.00	Res. ALJ-393; Bottom of range for Paralegal - Level II. See Comment 3	\$93.75	0.75	\$125.00 [5]	\$93.75
Sylvie Ashford, Energy Policy Analyst	2025	3.50	\$265.00	Res. ALJ-393, 2024 rate plus 3.46% COLA plus 5% step increase. See Comment 4	\$927.50	3.50	\$265.00 [6]	\$927.50
Jessica Hecht	2024	67.00	\$750.00	Res. ALJ-393 – New Rate, See Comment 5	\$50,250.00	67.00	\$750.00 [7,8]	\$50,250.00
Jessica Hecht	2025	12.50	\$750.00	Res. ALJ-393 – New Rate, See Comment 5	\$9,375.00	12.50	\$750.00 [7]	\$9,375.00
<b>Subtotal: \$283,633.75</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$283,633.75</b>		

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Elise Torres, TURN Attorney	2024	0.50	\$277.50	50% of 2024 Hourly Rate	\$138.75	0.50	\$277.50 [1]	\$138.75
Elise Torres, TURN Attorney	2025	17.75	\$300.00	50% of 2025 Hourly Rate	\$5,325.00	17.75	\$300.00 [1]	\$5,325.00
Isabella Montoya, TURN Legal Fellow	2024	1.5	\$105.00	50% of 2024 Hourly Rate	\$ 157.50	1.50	\$105.00 [3]	\$157.50
Reina Yanagiba, TURN Legal Assistant	2025	2.00	\$62.50	50% of 2025 Hourly Rate	\$125.00	2.00	\$62.50 [5]	\$125.00
<b>Subtotal: \$5,746.25</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$5,746.25</b>		
<b>TOTAL REQUEST: \$289,380.00</b>						<b>TOTAL AWARD: \$289,380.00</b>		
<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 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.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate</p>								
ATTORNEY INFORMATION								
Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR <sup>3</sup>	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation					
Elise Torres	December 2011	280443	No					

<sup>3</sup> This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

CLAIMED			CPUC AWARD
Hayley Goodson	December 2003	228535	No
Matthew Freedman	March 2001	214812	No

**C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III<sup>4</sup>:**

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Attachment 1	Certificate of Service
Attachment 2	Timesheets for TURN Attorneys/Experts
Attachment 3	TURN hours allocated by issue
Attachment 4	Jessica Hecht Resume
Attachment 5	Jessica Hecht – TURN Consulting Agreement
Comment #1	<p><b>2025 Rate for Elise Torres</b></p> <p>For Ms. Torres's work in 2025, TURN requests that the Commission adjust her 2024 rate of \$555, authorized in D.25-03-022, in two regards: (1) by applying the annual escalation adjustment authorized by Resolution ALJ-393, 3.46%; and (2) further adjusting Ms. Torres's hourly rate by 5% to recognize her move from Attorney - Level III (5-10 years) to Attorney - Level IV (10-15 years). In D.08-04-010, the Commission recognized moving to a higher experience tier as one of the circumstances that qualifies an intervenor representative for a rate increase, apart from annual COLA adjustments and "step" increases. (D.08-04-010, p. 8). The requested rate adjustment for Ms. Torres’s change in experience tier is consistent with the Commission’s adoption of a similar adjustment in setting TURN Attorney David Cheng’s 2024 hourly rate in D.24-07-030. (D.24-07-030, p. 11).</p> <p>Ms. Torres was admitted to the CA bar in December 2011. In D.21-12-049, which authorized the first rate for Ms. Torres pursuant to Resolution ALJ-393, the Commission recognized that Ms. Torres had worked in utility regulation for 9 years and practiced as an attorney for 7 ½ years in setting her 2021 rate in the Attorney – Level III labor role. (D.21-12-049, p. 25). By 2025, Ms. Torres has four more years of experience, putting her squarely in the Attorney – Level IV labor role, with 11 ½ years practicing law and 13 ½ years of directly relevant experience working in utility regulation. TURN has not previously requested a rate that recognizes this change in Ms. Torres’ experience. Consistent with prior decisions, the Commission should continue to recognize that “professional experience gained by a practitioner ... while employed in a role other than an attorney</p>

<sup>4</sup> Attachments not included in final Decision.

<b>Attachment or Comment #</b>	<b>Description/Comment</b>
	<p>can nonetheless confer directly relevant skills and expertise which warrant consideration in determining hourly rates for purposes of the Intervenor Compensation Program.” (D.24-07-030, p. 11, citing D.19-04-035, p. 13).</p> <p>TURN accordingly requests a 2025 rate for Ms. Torres of \$600. Calculation: <math>\\$555 \times [1.0346 \text{ (COLA)} + 0.05 \text{ (move to higher tier)}] = \\$601.95</math>, rounded to \$600.</p>
Comment #2	<p><b>2025 Rate for Isabella Montoya</b></p> <p>TURN requests an hourly rate of \$230 for TURN Legal Fellow Isabella Montoya in 2025. The requested rate is equal to the rate authorized by the Commission in D.25-10-023 for Ms. Montoya’s work as a Public Policy Analyst in 2024, \$210, adjusted by both the 2025 escalation rate of 3.46% and the first 5% step increase for Ms. Montoya. Calculation: <math>\\$210 \times [1.0346 \text{ (COLA)} + 0.05 \text{ (step increase)}] = \\$227.77</math>, rounded to \$230.</p>
Comment #3	<p><b>2025 Rate for Reina Yanagiba</b></p> <p>TURN requests a 2025 hourly rate of \$125 for TURN Paralegal Reina Yanagiba, who joined TURN in October 2022. The Commission adopted a 2023 hourly rate of \$95 for Ms. Yanagiba in D.24-04-030 and a 2024 hourly rate of \$100 in D.24-06-021. The requested rate of \$125 is consistent with the bottom of the 2025 hourly rate range for a Paralegal – Level II (\$123.36)</p>
Comment #4	<p><b>2025 Rate for Sylvie Ashford</b></p> <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: <math>\\$245 \times [1.0346 \text{ (COLA)} + 0.05 \text{ (step increase)}] = \\$265.73</math>, rounded to \$265.</p>
Comment #5	<p><b>2024 and 2025 Hourly Rate for Jessica Hecht</b></p> <p>Pursuant to the requirements of ALJ-393, TURN hereby submits its request for a 2024-2025 hourly rate for TURN Consultant and Expert Witness Jessica Hecht.</p> <p><b>Intervenor Representative:</b> Jessica Hecht <b>Labor Role:</b> Public Policy Analyst <b>Level:</b> V</p>

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	<p><b>2024 Hourly Rate Range:</b> \$572.11 (low) - \$731.01 (median) - \$948.83 (high)</p> <p><b>2025 Hourly Rate Range:</b> \$597.40 (low) - \$756.30 (median) - \$974.12 (high)</p> <p><b>Requested Hourly Rate:</b> \$750</p> <p><b>Current Resume:</b> See Attachment 4.</p> <p><b>Justification for the Requested Hourly Rate:</b></p> <p>TURN requests an hourly rate of \$750 for consultant Jessica Hecht for her work in 2024 and 2025 in this proceeding. This is the rate charged to TURN by Ms. Hecht. The requested rate is comparable to the median hourly rates in 2024 and 2025 for the Public Policy Analyst - Level V labor role.</p> <p>Jessica Hecht is a senior policy and regulatory analyst with deep experience in utility infrastructure, safety, and energy issues. Ms. Hecht worked at the California Public Utilities Commission from 2001-2023. During these 22 years, she obtained invaluable knowledge and experience related to energy policy and public utility regulation. She initially served as a Public Utilities Regulatory Analyst from 2001-2006, with responsibilities for drafting policies and testimony aimed at making energy and telecommunications services more accessible. From 2013-2016, she served as a Policy Advisor to a Commissioner and provided expert advice to state utility Commissioners regarding all aspects of California energy, telecommunications, water, and transportation policy issues. Ms. Hecht spent most of her tenure at the Commission in the Administrative Law Judge Division. She served as an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) from 2007-2018 (excluding her time as a Policy Advisor to a Commissioner) and 2020-2023 and as Assistant Chief ALJ from 2018-2020. As an ALJ, Ms. Hecht was a substantive decision-maker and process manager focused on utilities and infrastructure. She prepared decisions resolving financial, economic, environmental, and consumer protection issues. In her capacity as Assistant Chief ALJ, Ms. Hecht served as the ALJ Division lead on safety and wildfire-related policy and case management, with additional responsibility for energy policy and rates. After leaving the Commission in 2023, Ms. Hecht has been working as a consultant and focusing on complex policy analysis, among other issues.</p> <p>Ms. Hecht has a M.A. in Public Affairs and Policy Analysis from the University of Wisconsin – Madison and a B.A. in History from the University of California at Berkeley.</p> <p>The Market Rate Study Hourly Rate Chart describes a Public Policy Analyst as one who: “Reviews the impact of state government policies and</p>

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	<p>regulations. Analyzes proposed legislative actions and determines the potential impact. Reviews policies, plans, and programs to ensure consistency with corresponding government regulations and laws.” Further, a “Public Policy Analyst” in Level V should have a “Bachelor’s Degree” and 15+ years of experience. Jessica Hecht’s qualifications exceed these requirements. She has 22 years of experience working on utility regulatory policy issues at the Commission, including many years of preparing proposed decisions evaluating “policies, plans, and programs to ensure consistency with corresponding government regulations and laws.” She also has a Master’s Degree in Public Policy, beyond the required Bachelor’s Degree.</p> <p>As noted above, the requested hourly rate for 2024 and 2025 is comparable to the median rates for a Public Policy Analyst – Level V in 2024 and 2025. Given Ms. Hecht’s education and unique experience, TURN submits that a rate of \$750 is reasonable for her work on behalf of TURN in this proceeding.</p>

**C. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments:**

Item	Reason
<p>[1] Elise Torres 2024 and 2025 Hourly Rates</p>	<p>TURN requested a 2024 hourly rate of \$555.00 as a Legal – Attorney – III and 2025 hourly rate of \$600.00 as a Legal – Attorney – IV.</p> <p>D.25-03-022 verified a 2024 hourly rate of \$555.00 as a Legal – Attorney – III. We apply the same rate here.</p> <p>Review of the submitted resume reflects 10+ years of experience at the time of filing and therefore Torres qualifies as a Legal – Attorney – IV. Per the Market Rate Study Hourly Rate Chart, the 2025 rate range for an Attorney – IV is \$462.33 to \$699.81, with a median of \$577.67. Given Elise Torres’ relevant experience, we find the requested rate of \$600.00 to be reasonable and adopt it here.</p> <p>Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation is rated at ½ preparer’s normal rate, bringing the 2024 and 2025 claim preparation rate to \$277.50 and \$300.00, respectively.</p>
<p>[2] Hayley Goodson 2024 Hourly Rate</p>	<p>D.24-09-017 verified a 2024 hourly rate of \$680.00 as a Legal – Attorney – V. We apply the same rate here.</p>

Item	Reason
[3] Isabella Montoya 2024 and 2025 Hourly Rates	<p>TURN requested a 2024 and 2025 hourly rate of \$210.00 and \$230.00 for Isabella Montoya. We note the 2025 rate request includes the first available 5% step-increase.</p> <p>D.25-10-023 verified a 2024 hourly rate of \$210.00 an Expert – Public Policy Analyst – I. We apply the same rate here.</p> <p>Based on the adopted 2024 rate, the 3.46% 2025 escalation factor, first 5% step-increase and rounding to the nearest allowable \$5 increment:</p> <p>2025: \$210.00 x 1.0846 = \$230.00</p> <p>We find the requested 2025 hourly rate of \$230.00 reasonable and adopt it here. Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation is rated at ½ preparer’s normal rate, bringing the 2024 claim preparation rate to \$105.00.</p>
[4] Matthew Freedman 2024 and 2025 Hourly Rates	<p>D.24-09-015 verified a 2024 hourly rate of \$740.00. We apply the same rate here.</p> <p>D.25-10-059 verified a 2025 hourly rate of \$795.00. We apply the same rate here.</p>
[5] Reina Yanagiba 2024 and 2025 Hourly Rates	<p>TURN requested a 2024 hourly rate of \$100.00 as a Legal – Paralegal – I and 2025 hourly rate of \$125.00 as a Legal – Paralegal – II.</p> <p>D.24-06-021 verified a 2024 hourly rate of \$100.00 as a Legal – Paralegal – I. We apply the same rate here.</p> <p>Review of the submitted resume found 2+ years of relevant experience as a Paralegal at the time of filing, qualifying as a Legal – Paralegal – II. Per the Market Rate Study Hourly Rate Chart, the 2025 rate range for a Paralegal – II is \$123.36 to \$184.32, with a median of \$151.64. We find the requested 2025 hourly rate of \$125.00 as a Legal – Paralegal – II reasonable and adopt it here.</p> <p>Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation is rated at ½ preparer’s normal rate, bringing the 2025 claim preparation rate to \$62.50.</p>
[6] Sylvie Ashford 2024 and 2025 Hourly Rates	<p>TURN requested a 2024 hourly rate of \$245.00 as an Expert – Public Policy Analyst - I and 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>

Item	Reason
	<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 x 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>[7] Jessica Hecht 2024 and 2025 Consultant Rates</p>	<p>TURN has confirmed that Jessica Hecht is a consultant. Pursuant to Commission policy, 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>TURN has confirmed that it paid Jessica Hecht \$750.00 per hour for work in this proceeding. We find this rate reasonable given Jessica Hecht’s experience, and approve this rate here.</p> <p>The award determined herein for Jessica Hecht’s contribution in this proceeding shall be paid in full to Jessica Hecht, 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>[8] 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> <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</p>

Item	Reason
	<p>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. 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</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))**

<b>A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?</b>	No
---	----

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The Utility Reform Network has made a substantial contribution to D.25-08-036.
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 \$289,380.00.

**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 \$289,380.00.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Bear Valley Electric, Inc., PacifiCorp d.b.a. PacificPower, Liberty Utilities, and Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall pay The Utility Reform Network their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2024 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 14, 2026, the 75<sup>th</sup> 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 May 14, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

JOHN REYNOLDS  
President  
DARCIE L. HOUCK  
KAREN DOUGLAS  
MATTHEW BAKER  
Commissioners

Commissioner Christine Harada recused herself from this agenda item and was not part of the quorum in its consideration.

## APPENDIX

## Compensation Decision Summary Information

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>	D2605030	<b>Modifies Decision?</b>	No
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D2508036		
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	R2401018		
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Dugowson		
<b>Payer(s):</b>	Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Bear Valley Electric, Inc., PacifiCorp d.b.a. PacificPower, Liberty Utilities, and Pacific Gas and Electric Company		

## Intervenor Information

<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>Date Claim Filed</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Awarded</b>	<b>Multiplier?</b>	<b>Reason Change/Disallowance</b>
The Utility Reform Network	October 31, 2025	\$289,380.00	\$289,380.00	N/A	See Part III.D CPUC Comments, Disallowances and Adjustments.

## Hourly Fee Information

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Attorney, Expert, or Advocate</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Year Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Adopted</b>
Elise	Torres	Attorney	\$555	2024	\$555.00
Elise	Torres	Attorney	\$600	2025	\$600.00
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	\$680	2024	\$680.00
Isabella	Montoya	Legal Fellow	\$210	2024	\$210.00
Isabella	Montoya	Legal Fellow	\$230	2025	\$230.00
Matthew	Freedman	Attorney	\$740	2024	\$740.00
Matthew	Freedman	Attorney	\$805	2025	\$805.00
Reina	Yanagiba	Legal Assistant	\$100	2024	\$100.00
Reina	Yanagiba	Legal Assistant	\$125	2025	\$125.00
Sylvie	Ashford	Analyst	\$265	2025	\$265.00

Jessica	Hecht	Expert <sup>5</sup>	\$750	2024	\$750.00
Jessica	Hecht	Expert <sup>5</sup>	\$750	2025	\$750.00

**(END OF APPENDIX)**

---

<sup>5</sup> Jessica Hecht served as a consultant.