

Decision 26-08-025 August 13, 2026

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company
(U 902 E) for Authority to Update Marginal Costs,
Cost Allocation, and Electric Rate Design.

Application 23-01-008

DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 25-09-006

Intervenor: CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY (CforAT)	For contribution to Decision (D.) 25-09-006
Claimed: \$56,017.50	Awarded: \$55,393.50
Assigned Commissioner: John Reynolds ¹	Assigned ALJ: Marcelo Poirier ²

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	D.25-09-008 adopted three settlements to resolve SDG&E's 2024 General Rate Case Phase 2 proceeding. One of the settlements was a Medical Baseline Settlement Agreement that provides for a line-item medical baseline discount for opt-in rates. It also phases in a reduction in the benefits received by current medical baseline customers to align with the other IOUs; this element of the agreement was approved over CforAT's opposition.
--	--

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812³:

	INTERVENOR	CPUC VERIFICATION
--	-------------------	------------------------------

¹ Application 23-01-008 was reassigned from President Alice Reynolds to President John Reynolds on May 27, 2026.

² Application 23-01-008 was reassigned from Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Rajan Mutialu to ALJ Marcelo Poirier on April 9, 2026.

³ All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

	INTERVENOR	CPUC VERIFICATION
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	May 10, 2023	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI filed:	June 9, 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 below	R.22-11-013
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	See below	March 15, 2024
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	See below	
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:	See below	R.22-11-013
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	See below	March 15, 2024
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	See below	
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.25-09-006	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	September 22, 2025	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	November 21, 2025	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	INTERVENOR'S COMMENT(S)	CPUC DISCUSSION
	CforAT's most recent formal finding of eligible customer status and significant financial hardship was issued in R.22-11-013 on March 15, 2024; the finding prior to that was issued in the same proceeding on June 14, 2023. A new ruling has been requested in a number of proceedings, with details of eligibility provided in an NOI submitted in R.24-04-010, filed on July 17, 2025. CforAT has routinely been found eligible for intervenor compensation by the Commission.	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
As part of its Application, SDG&E proposed to modify its medical basement program to provide eligible customers on untiered opt-in rates with access to a medical discount and also to reduce its current discount for Medical Baseline program participants over the course of a four-year glidepath. Its justification was that the reduction would bring its medical discount rate into alignment with that of the other major IOUs.	General background.	Noted, CforAT is providing background information regarding this Decision.
CforAT protested the Application, addressing the need for SDG&E to provide medical discounts for untiered opt-in rates, SDG&E's medical baseline and medical discount proposals, and specifically its proposal to reduce its level of medical discount. CforAT Protest to Application of SDG&E, filed February 16, 2023.	The Scoping Memo issued in this proceeding expressly includes issues surrounding SDG&E's proposals for revising the medical baseline discount. Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling, issued on June 5, 2023, at p. 2.	Verified
CforAT provided testimony demonstrating that the reduction in discount to the existing medical	CforAT's testimony and discovery responses were included in the record of the	Verified

baseline customers would result in substantial bill increases while providing extremely limited reductions to the bills of other customers. CforAT's Testimony was entered into the record as Exh. CforAT-1. Discovery conducted by CforAT demonstrating the bill impacts was entered into the record as Exh. CforAT-2. Joint Motion to Admit Party Exhibits into the Record, filed on May 20, 2024, at p. A-6.	proceeding. E-mail Ruling Granting Joint Motion to Enter Exhibits into Evidentiary Record, issued June 7, 2024.	
SDG&E entered into a settlement on the issue of changes to its medical baseline program and the associated medical discount with Cal Advocates, and TURN over the objection of CforAT, the City of San Diego, and UCAN (Opposing Parties). Opposition of Center for Accessible Technology, Utility Consumers' Action Network and City of San Diego to Motion of SDG&E, Cal Advocates and TURN for Adoption of Medical Baseline Settlement Agreement in the 20204 General Rate Case Phase 2 (Opposition to Settlement Motion), filed on July 3, 2024. The Opposition to Settlement Motion argued that the participants in the proposed settlement do not adequately represent the interests of those who are most impacted (pp. 3-5) and that the proposed reduction of benefits to exiting Medical Baseline customers is not reasonable nor is it in the public interest (pp. 5-10), and highlighted the bill impacts on those customers (see chart on p.6). Opposing Parties did not oppose other provisions of the settlement including the adoption of a medical discount for	The Medical Baseline Settlement Agreement is discussed in the Decision at pp. 53- Separately, the Decision approves the cost recovery of the medical baseline program through the public purpose program surcharge, which CforAT supported as part of the broad Partial Settlement Agreement. Decision at pp. 43-44. In the discussion of the Medical Baseline Settlement, the Decision acknowledged that existing Medical Baseline customers will receive a lower discount than they currently receive, with reductions being phased in over four years. Decision at pp. 60-61. It also cites to the information provided by CforAT on the estimated bill increases for Medical Baseline customers at the end of the glidepath. Decision at p. 58. Upon consideration, the Decision determines in light of the whole record that the Medical Baseline Settlement is	Verified

untiered opt-in rates, the presentation of medical discounts as a line item on a customer's bill and the applicable calculation for determining the benefits for customers who are enrolled in both the medical baseline/medical discount program and another program such as CARE or FERA. Opposition to Settlement Motion at p. 11. While the Decision adopts the settlement over CforAT and other party objections, CforAT's input informed the Commission's deliberations and provided a substantial record for consideration, which is sufficient to support a claim for compensation. As was the case with TURN in the proceeding resulting in D.08-04-004, CforAT here provided "important information regarding all issues that needed to be considered" in determining whether to approve the Medical Baseline Settlement Agreement.	consistent with the law and in the public interest and so adopts it. Decision at p. 60. While CforAT continues to disagree, the fact that the Commission adopted the settlement does not prevent an award of compensation. It is well established that an intervenor may be awarded compensation even if the Commission does not adopt its recommendations if the intervenor's input enhances the ability of the Commission to effectively consider the issues before it. Specifically, the Commission has recognized that it "may benefit from an intervenor's participation even where the Commission did not adopt any of the intervenor's positions or recommendations." D.08-04-004 at pp. 5-6; <i>see also</i> D.09-04-027 at p. 4 awarding compensation to TURN and found a substantial contribution even on issues where TURN did not prevail as TURN's efforts "contributed to the inclusion of these issues in the Commission's deliberations"). The Commission has also found that it can find that a customer made a substantial contribution "if a customer provided a unique perspective that enriched the Commission's deliberations and the record." D.08-04-004 at p. 5.	
--	--	--

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	Yes
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Yes
c. If so, provide name of other parties: UCAN and the City of San Diego joined CforAT in opposition to key elements of the Medical Baseline Settlement Agreement. All parties, including CforAT, agreed on providing a medical discount to eligible customers on untiered opt-in rates, providing the discounts as a line-item on customer bills, the method for calculating multiple discounts for customers receiving both a medical benefit and a discount through CARE or FERA, and paying for the discounts through the PPP charge.		Noted
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: Throughout this proceeding, CforAT focused on issues related to the Medical Baseline program and the need for an equivalent medical discount for eligible customers who select an opt-in untiered rate. CforAT's broader participation was limited to the extent necessary to participate effectively and remain aware of the broader issues within the proceeding. For example, the issue of recovery of costs of the medical baseline program was addressed in the broader partial settlement, requiring CforAT to monitor and occasionally participate in the broader settlement discussions. The issues related to MBL are of high significance to our constituency of utility customers with disabilities and medical needs, and CforAT took the lead on this issue, including in settlement negotiations and in eventual opposition. While other parties joined CforAT's opposition to the eventual MBL settlement, their work complemented and supplemented that of CforAT and should not result in any denial of compensation based on duplication of effort.		Noted

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§§ 1801 and 1806):**

	CPUC DISCUSSION
a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness: Among other matters, the Phase 2 Application from SDG&E addressed meaningful changes to the benefits available to customers with medical needs that impact their level of energy consumption. These customers are all part of CforAT’s constituency. CforAT directly focused our participation in this proceeding on the Medical Baseline and medical discount proposals, including efforts to reach a negotiated resolution and opposition to a resolution reached by other parties over our objections. While the Commission adopted a resolution that will have harmful bill impacts for these customers (over our objection), CforAT believes that the impact of the changes to customers with medical needs are less severe than would have been the case but for our participation. We also argue that the awareness we brought to the impacts on customers with medical needs has value in that it will keep the issue of the concerns of these customers visible for stakeholders and policymakers. While it is difficult to quantify the impacts of CforAT’s participation, our advocacy on behalf of our constituency helped to ensure scrutiny of proposals that impact their utility bills and the availability of medical benefits. This ongoing scrutiny has value. Because of the importance of ensuring that residential customers with medical needs, who represent a particularly vulnerable constituency, have focused representation separate from organizations that represent residential customers as a whole, CforAT’s request for intervenor compensation is reasonable.	Noted
b. Reasonableness of hours claimed: CforAT focused our work specifically on the limited set of issues most relevant to our constituency, namely those regarding the Medical Baseline program and the availability of a medical discount for untiered opt-in rates. In our narrowly targeted work, we participated efficiently and reasonably in the necessary activities taking place within a much broader proceeding. CforAT’s activity was led by Legal Director Melissa W. Kasnitz, who has participated in numerous rate design proceedings before the Commission, including numerous GRC Phase 2 proceedings. Ms. Kasnitz appropriately delegated some tasks to junior attorneys with lower billing rates, including first to Alexandra Green, then CforAT’s Legal Fellow (following the conclusion of her legal fellowship at CforAT, Ms. Green is now a Staff Attorney at TURN), who assisted with preparing the protest to the initial application and preparing discovery. After Ms. Green departed CforAT, our subsequent Legal Fellow, Rachel Sweetnam (now a Staff Attorney), further assisted with discovery on the impacts of the Medical Baseline proposals. At all times, Ms. Kasnitz appropriately supervised the junior attorneys. This form of delegation with	Noted

	CPUC DISCUSSION
appropriate supervision achieves reasonable overall efficiency and cost. Time spent delegating and overseeing work is efficient and necessary and still results in lower overall cost than would be the case without such delegation of responsibility due to the differences in hourly rates between Ms. Kasnitz and the junior attorneys.	
c. Allocation of hours by issue: 2023 Time – Kasnitz (13.8 hours) General Participation: 6.5 hours The issue area “General Participation” includes time spent on procedural matters and on reviewing and tracking issues where CforAT did not provide substantive input but was required to follow in order to participate effectively in the proceeding overall. In 2023, specifically, it included time spent early in the proceeding, including time preparing for and participating in the PHC, which are necessary for participation but cannot be attributed to a specific substantive issue. However, during the PHC and in the initial review of the application and other party input, CforAT was focused on our key issue of the impact of the proposals on the Medical Baseline program and customers with medical needs. MBL: 6.7 hours The issue area MBL includes time spent addressing the impacts of the Application on customers enrolled in the Medical Baseline Program or who may subsequently enroll in either the Medical Baseline Program or the medical discount. This includes time spent developing strategy for addressing these issues, participating in settlement efforts, and eventually opposing the adoption of the adopted Medical Baseline Settlement Agreement. Settlement: 0.6 hours The issue area “Settlement” includes time spent addressing the global settlement process including monitoring the broader settlement for the limited issues relevant to the Medical Baseline program (e.g. allocating program costs to the PPP fund) and monitoring procedural activity regarding the various settlements. 2023 Time – Green (12.7 hours) General Participation: 2.8 hours MBL: 9.9 hours 2024 Time – Kasnitz (42.2 hours) General Participation: 9.0 In 2024, time allocated to “General Participation” included participation in required Status Conferences (including preparation of a joint status conference statement) and review of various rulings, all of which were necessary to effectively follow and participate in the overall proceeding. At all times during	Noted

	CPUC DISCUSSION
these required activities, CforAT's focus remained on the issues relevant to our constituency. MBL: 27.9 Settlement: 5.3 2024 Time – Sweetnam (4.3 hours) General Participation: 1.1 hours MBL: 3.2 hours 2025 Time – Kasnitz (9.5 hours) General Participation: 0.2 hours MBL: 9.3 hours	

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	13.80	\$715.00	D.24-06-018	\$9,867.00	13.80	\$715.00 [1]	\$9,867.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2024	42.20	\$735.00	D.24-10-028	\$31,017.00	42.20	\$735.00 [1]	\$31,017.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2025	9.50	\$755.00	D.25-10-060	\$7,172.50	9.50	\$755.00 [1]	\$7,172.50
Alexandra Green	2023	12.70	\$ 220.00	D.24-09-018	\$2,794.00	12.70	\$220.00 [3]	\$2,794.00
Rachel Sweetnam	2024	4.30	\$240.00	D.25-04-041	\$1,032.00	1.70 [4]	\$240.00 [2]	\$408.00
Subtotal: \$ 51,882.50						Subtotal: \$51,258.50		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2023	0.40	\$357.50	½ D.24-06-018	\$143.00	0.40	\$357.50 [1]	\$143.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2025	10.40	\$377.50	½ D.25-10-060	\$3,926.00	10.40	\$377.50 [1]	\$3,926.00

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
Alexandra Green	2023	0.60	\$110.00	½ D.24-09-018	\$66.00	0.60	\$110.00 [3]	\$66.00
Subtotal: \$4,135.00						Subtotal: \$4,135.00		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$56,017.50						TOTAL AWARD: \$55,393.50		
*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award (§1804(d)). Intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor’s records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award. <i>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate</i>								
ATTORNEY INFORMATION								
Attorney		Date Admitted to CA BAR ⁴		Member Number		Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation		
Melissa W. Kasnitz		1992		162679		No		
Rachel Sweetnam		2023		350075		No		
Alexandra Green		2022		346771		No		

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III⁵:

ATTACHMENT OR COMMENT #	DESCRIPTION/COMMENT
1	Certificate of Service

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

ITEM	REASON
[1] Melissa Kasnitz (Kasnitz) 2023, 2024 and 2025 Hourly Rates	D.24-06-020 approved a 2023 hourly rate of \$715.00 for Kasnitz. As Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation hours are compensated at ½ preparer's normal hourly rate, we apply the rate of \$357.50 for Kasnitz. D.24-10-028 approved a 2024 hourly rate of \$735.00 for Kasnitz.

⁴ This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

⁵ Attachments not included in the final Decision.

ITEM	REASON
	D.25-10-060 approved a 2025 hourly rate of \$755.00 for Kasnitz. As Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation hours are compensated at $\frac{1}{2}$ preparer's normal hourly rate, we apply the rate of \$377.50 for Kasnitz.
[2] Rachel Sweetnam (Sweetnam) 2024 Hourly Rate	D.25-04-041 approved a 2024 hourly rate of \$240.00 for Sweetnam.
[3] Alexandra Green (Green) 2023 Hourly Rate & Intervenor Compensation Rate	D.24-09-018 approved a 2023 rate of \$220.00 for Green. As Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation hours are compensated at $\frac{1}{2}$ preparer's normal hourly rate, we apply the rate of \$110.00 for Green.
[4] Sweetnam 2024 hours	It is unclear how some of the hours claimed by Sweetnam substantially contributed to the proceeding. Many of the timesheet entries reflect document and status review but do not identify any resulting work product, analysis or other activity demonstrating a substantial contribution to the proceeding. Additionally, some of the hours requested are for tasks that are duplicative of tasks carried out by Kasnitz. CforAT is reminded that the Commission awards compensation for efficient efforts that contribute to proceeding outcomes, and that CforAT's work should be sufficiently streamlined to prevent an excess of hours claimed. In the past, the Commission has disallowed inefficient activities and applied reductions to intervenor hours that reflect excessive internal duplicative efforts, such as "numerous internal communications, review of each other's documents, working on the same materials, engaging in the same tasks and participating in the same events." (See D.12-03-024 at 24-25). Accordingly, we disallow the following timesheet entries for lack of substantial contribution and/or duplication: • 02/06/2024: Review party DRs & responses (via discovery portal), 1.00 hours • 02/23/2024: Review SDG&E DR responses, 0.20 hours • 02/23/2024: Review joint status update, 0.10 hours • 02/26/2024: Attend status conference, 1.00 hours; • 05/14/2024: Review CforAT exhibits for background, 0.30 hours

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 (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	Yes
---	-----

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1.Center for Accessible Technology has made a substantial contribution to D.25-09-006.
- 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 \$55,393.50.

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 \$55,393.50.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, San Diego Gas and Electric 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 4, 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.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated August 13, 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:	D2608025	Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2509006		
Proceeding(s):	A2301008		
Author:	ALJ Marcelo Poirier		
Payer(s):	San Diego Gas and Electric Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Center for Accessible Technology	November 21, 2025	\$56,017.50	\$55,393.50	N/A	See Part III.D CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments above

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$715.00	2023	\$715.00
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$735.00	2024	\$735.00
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$755.00	2025	\$755.00
Alexandra	Green	Attorney	\$220.00	2023	\$220.00
Rachel	Sweetnam	Attorney	\$240.00	2024	\$240.00

(END OF APPENDIX)