

Decision 26-05-031 May 14, 2026

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338-E) For Authority to Increase Its Authorized Revenues for Electric Service In 2025, Among Other Things, and to Reflect That Increase in Rates.

Application 23-05-010
Filed May 12, 2023

DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION (D.) 25-09-030

Intervenor: Center for Accessible Technology	For contribution to Decision (D.) 25-09-030
Claimed: \$15,580.75	Awarded: \$11,061.26
Assigned Commissioner: Karen Douglas	Assigned ALJs: Colin Rizzo and Ehren Seybert

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	This decision establishes ratepayer funding for SCE for its upcoming General Rate Case cycle and directs SCE on implementation of various programs and requirements. Among the many issues addressed, the decision authorizes and adopts a Joint Proposal between SCE and CforAT that addressing spending to advance accessibility of SCE's facilities and services.
--	--

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:	July 12, 2023	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI filed:	August 8, 2023	August 9, 2023

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

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
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:	R.22-11-013 (DER Issues)	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	6/14/2023	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:	D.25-09-006	R.22-11-013
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	25-09-22	3/15/2024
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.25-09-030	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	September 25, 2025	September 23, 2025
15. File date of compensation request:	November 24, 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):

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
1. CforAT’s participation in this proceeding was extremely limited, focusing only on development of a new Accessibility Agreement (in the form of a Joint Proposal)	SCE submitted testimony jointly developed with CforAT concerning the Joint Proposal, which addresses SCE’s spending over the 2025 GRC cycle for activities supporting and enhancing the accessibility of SCE’s facilities,	Verified

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>for the new SCE GRC cycle and implementation of the Accessibility Joint Proposal that was in place during the prior cycle, including while this docket has been open. This is consistent with work that has been conducted and compensated in previous GRC cycles.</p>	<p>programs, communications, and services for customers with disabilities. Exhibit SCE-09. <i>See also</i> SCE Opening Brief, filed July 15, 2024, at p. 554 (discussing the Joint Proposal). SCE also met regularly with CforAT, consistent with its prior agreement, to discuss ongoing accessibility efforts, which assisted in developing the provisions of the new agreement.</p>	
<p>2. The new Accessibility Joint Proposal was negotiated directly between CforAT and SCE. No party opposed its adoption, and it was adopted by the Commission.</p> <p>D.25-09-030 at pp. 852-853 (authorizing and adopting the Joint Proposal between CforAT and SCE).</p>	<p>Both the current Joint Proposal and the prior Joint Proposal (adopted in D.21-08-036, issued August 20, 2021 in A.19-08-013, SCE’s 2021 GRC) include requirements for SCE to provide annual reports to CforAT and any other interested parties regarding SCE’s accessibility improvement activities and related spending and to meet with CforAT annually regarding planned accessibility improvement activities for the upcoming year. Exhibit SCE-09 at pp. 2-3; D.21-08-036 at pp. 551-552 (discussing Joint Proposal adopted for SCE’s 2021 GRC).</p> <p>The Commission has regularly compensated CforAT for its reasonable participation in these annual meetings. <i>See, e.g.</i>, D.22-08-048, issued August 26, 2022 in A.19-08-013, at pp. 5-9 (awarding compensation for all time spent in annual meetings with SCE and reviewing SCE’s annual reports); D.18-08-010, issued August 13, 2018 in A.15-09-001, at pp. 6, 9 (granting compensation to CforAT for its work in PG&E’s 2017 GRC, including implementation of accessibility commitments). While the Commission disallowed some hours regarding the annual review as duplicative, it accepted</p>	<p>Verified</p>

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
	the overall work participating in such activities as appropriate. <i>Id.</i> at p. 6 and p. 9.	
3. The Accessibility Joint Proposal continues the ongoing commitment by SCE to meet annually with CforAT to discuss its accessibility spending for the past year and prioritize spending plans for the next year. It is appropriate for CforAT to participate in these meetings (which are open to other interested parties) in conjunction with ensuring that SCE meets its accessibility obligations.	While not specifically noted in the Decision, the regular meetings inform negotiations for subsequent agreements and ensure that the funds allocated for accessibility efforts are spent appropriately.	Verified

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

	Intervenor’s Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Public Advocate’s Office of the Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding?	Yes	Verified
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	No	Noted
c. If so, provide name of other parties: While other parties advocated for the interests of consumers generally, and while no party opposed the positions advocated by CforAT, no other party had a focus on accessibility concerns for customers with disabilities.		Noted
d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication: As stated above, there were multiple parties representing the interests of consumers in this proceeding, but there were no other parties addressing disability access issues or examining how SCE ensures that its services and communications are accessible. This was the focus of CforAT’s participation. Because no other party addressed this issue, there was no duplication of effort.		Noted

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion

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>The only substantive issues addressed by CforAT were those focused on the unique needs of people with disabilities, including ongoing efforts to institutionalize SCE's commitment to effectively serving customers with disabilities via improved physical access to its services and facilities and communication access for disabled customers who cannot access information presented in standard formats. These issues were within the scope of the proceeding and built on agreements reached in prior GRC cycles. The Joint Proposal developed by SCE and CforAT was not contested by any party and was adopted in the final decision.</p> <p>In addition to the work to develop the joint proposal, CforAT monitored the ongoing work by SCE required by the prior Joint Proposal negotiated in the prior GRC and approved by the Commission. CforAT also appropriately monitored the ongoing progress of the overall proceeding overall proceeding.</p> <p>Given the results obtained for CforAT's constituency and the fact that these results were part of an extended GRC proceeding, CforAT's costs were modest and reasonable. Specifically, CforAT's costs total a small fraction of the funding specifically allocated for the benefit of CforAT's constituency in the GRC.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>The total amount of time claimed by CforAT is modest and reasonable given the scope and length of this proceeding. CforAT focused on developing the new Joint Proposal and monitoring work done under the prior Joint Proposal, with limited and appropriate work to monitor the ongoing progress of the overall proceeding.</p> <p>CforAT's Legal Director, Melissa Kasnitz, has worked regularly with SCE and other IOUs overseeing development and implementation of accessibility commitments. She was appropriately assisted in this work by</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	CPUC Discussion
<p>CforAT’s Policy Analyst, Kate Woodford, who has experience in work with utility reports and commitments, and whose billing rate is substantially lower than that of Ms. Kasnitz.</p> <p>Additionally, much of the work preparing this compensation request was delegated to junior Staff Attorney Rachel Sweetnam, whose billing rate is also substantially lower than that of Ms. Kasnitz. This delegation of work, with appropriate review by Ms. Kasnitz, was efficient and appropriate.</p>	
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Kasnitz Time – 2023 (6.3 hours total)</p> <p>Agreement: 4.3 hours (68%) The issue area designated “Agreement” includes all time spent negotiating the Joint Testimony memorializing the SCE Accessibility Agreement for the new GRC cycle.</p> <p>General Participation: 2.0 hours (32%) The issue area designated “General Participation” includes all time spent monitoring the progress of the overall proceeding, including participation at the PHC and other necessary procedural steps.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Woodford Time – 2023 (1.6 hours total)</p> <p>Accessibility: 0.2 hours (12%) The issue area designated “Accessibility includes all work negotiating the Joint Proposal addressing SCE’s commitments to provide accessible service to its customers with disabilities as well as time spent monitoring its implementation of new and existing accessibility commitments.</p> <p>Agreement: 1.4 hours (88%)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Kasnitz Time – 2024 (1.7 hours total)</p> <p>Accessibility: 1.7 hours (100%)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Woodford Time -2024 (4.7 hours total)</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	CPUC Discussion
<p>Accessibility: 4.7 hours (100%)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Kasnitz Time – 2025 (4.7 hours total)</p> <p>Accessibility: 2.1 hours (45%)</p> <p>General Participation: 2.6 hours (55%)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Woodford Time – 2025 (6.7 hours)</p> <p>Accessibility: 6.7 hours (100%)</p>	

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2023	6.3	\$ 715	D.24-06-018	\$ 4,504.50	5.55 [3]	\$715.00	\$3,968.25
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2024	1.7	\$ 735	D.24-10-028	\$ 1,249.50	1.20 [3]	\$735.00	\$882.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2025	4.7	\$ 755	D.25-10-060	\$ 3,548.50	2.35 [3, 4]	\$755.00	\$1,774.25
Kate Woodford	2023	1.6	\$ 280	D.24-06-020	\$ 448.00	1.00 [3]	\$280.00	\$280.00
Kate Woodford	2024	4.7	\$ 290	See below	\$ 1,363.00	4.20 [3]	\$290.00	\$1,218.00
Kate Woodford	2025	6.7	\$ 380	See below	\$ 2,546.00	5.85 [3]	\$300.00 [1]	\$1,755.00
Subtotal: \$ 13,659.50						Subtotal: \$9,877.50		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2023	1	\$ 357.50	½ 2023 awarded rate	\$ 357.50	1.00	\$357.50	\$357.50

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2025	1.5	\$ 377.50	½ 2025 awarded rate	\$ 566.25	0.75 [5]	\$377.50	\$283.13
Rachel Sweetnam	2025	5.7	\$ 175	½ 2025 rate (awarded in D.25-10-060)	\$ 997.50	3.95 [5]	\$137.50 [2]	\$543.13
Subtotal: \$ 1,921.25						Subtotal: \$1,183.76		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$ 15,580.75						TOTAL AWARD: \$11,061.26		

*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.

**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
Melissa W. Kasnitz	1992	162679	No
Rachel Sweetnam	2023	350075	No

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III:³

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
[1] Woodford’s 2025 Hourly Rate	D.25-07-028 adopted a 2024 hourly rate of \$290.00 for Woodford. In Part III.B, CforAT requested an hourly rate of \$380.00 but provides insufficient support for the requested increase. We therefore apply the 3.46% escalation from Resolution ALJ-393 to establish a 2025 hourly rate of \$300.00.

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 are not included in the final Decision.

Item	Reason
<p>[2] Sweetnam’s 2025 Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation Hourly Rate</p>	<p>D.25-10-060 adopted a 2025 hourly rate of \$275.00 for Sweetnam. We apply one-half of Sweetnam’s 2025 adopted rate of \$275.00 for an intervenor compensation claim preparation rate of \$137.50.</p>
<p>[3] Internal Duplication</p>	<p>The Commission compensates intervenors for reasonable and efficient participation that contributes to the development of the record and aids in decision-making. However, we find that CforAT's claimed hours reflect a significant duplication of effort. Specifically, multiple representatives—whether attorneys or experts—worked on the same issues, attended the same meetings, hearings, or workshops, and participated in activities where only one representative would have been sufficient, given the relative simplicity or limited scope of the issues involved.</p> <p>This level of staffing resulted in unnecessary, redundant, and inefficient participation that did not provide added value to the proceeding. Accordingly, we find that the involvement of multiple representatives in these instances was not justified and resulted in excessive hours. As a result, we reduce the claim by 4.05 hours to ensure that only reasonable and non-duplicative efforts are compensated, which breaks down as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kasnitz 2023: 0.75 hours reduced • Kasnitz 2024: 0.50 hours reduced • Kasnitz 2025: 0.85 hours reduced • Woodford 2023: 0.60 hours reduced • Woodford 2024: 0.50 hours reduced • Woodford 2025: 0.85 hours reduced
<p>[4] Excessive General Participation</p>	<p>Per the Intervenor Compensation Program Guide at 26, timesheet records should not excessively categorize work under “General” participation. Normally, intervenors may use the General Participation category for preliminary preparation and analysis required to gain general knowledge of a proceeding, however, this should not be a significant portion of the representative’s time. Most professional work can be, and must be tied to specific, substantive issues in the proceeding. In this case, the timesheet records show that Kasnitz dedicated 4.60 hours, or over a third of Kasnitz’s total time, to general participation. We find this amount excessive.</p> <p>We find the 2.00 hours Kasnitz spent in 2023 attending the prehearing conference and reviewing the scoping memo to be reasonable. However, we find the 2.60 hours of Kasnitz’s general participation in 2025 to be excessive.</p>

Item	Reason
	Accordingly, we are reducing 1.50 hours of Kasnitz’s 2025 general participation hours because they were not adequately linked to specific issues or shown to have contributed meaningfully to the Commission’s decision-making process.
[5] Claim Preparation Reduction	<p><u>Excessive Hours Preparing This Request for Compensation</u></p> <p>CforAT claimed 7.20 hours for preparation of the intervenor compensation request. While the claim was detailed, well-organized, and generally compliant with Commission requirements, we find the preparation hours excessive given the scope of issues and overall scale of the request.</p> <p>CforAT has significant experience practicing before the Commission and preparing similar claims, and we would expect greater efficiency in compiling this request. Additionally, CforAT did not provide a rationale explaining why this particular claim—smaller in scale than some of their previous submissions—required this level of effort.</p> <p>Accordingly, we reduce the claimed hours by 2.50 hours, awarding 4.70 hours for claim preparation, which we break down below. This adjustment better reflects the complexity and scale of the request.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kasnitz’s 2025 Claim Preparation: 0.75 hours reduced • Sweetnam’s 2025 Claim Preparation: 1.75 hours reduced

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. Center for Accessible Technology has made a substantial contribution to D.25-09-030.
2. The requested hourly rates for Center for Accessible Technology’s representatives, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$11,061.26.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. Center for Accessible Technology is awarded \$11,061.26.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Southern California Edison Company shall pay Center for Accessible Technology 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 7, 2026, the 75th day after the filing of Center for Accessible Technology's request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated May 14, 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:	D2605031	Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2509030		
Proceeding(s):	A2305010		
Author:	ALJ Colin Rizzo and ALJ Ehren Seybert		
Payer(s):	Southern California Edison Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Center for Accessible Technology	November 24, 2025	\$15,580.75	\$11,061.26	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
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$715	2023	\$715.00
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$735	2024	\$735.00
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$755	2025	\$755.00
Kate	Woodford	Advocate	\$290	2024	\$290.00
Kate	Woodford	Advocate	\$380	2025	\$300.00
Rachel	Sweetnam	Attorney	\$275	2025	\$275.00

(END OF APPENDIX)