

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE SASHA GOLDBERG** (Mailed 7/8/2026)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Green Power Institute for award of intervenor compensation for substantial contributions to Resolution Number SPD-26.

Application 24-11-002

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO GREEN POWER INSTITUTE FOR
SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO RESOLUTION SPD-26**

Intervenor: Green Power Institute	For contribution to Resolution SPD-26
Claimed: \$16,525	Awarded: \$5,573.70
Commissioner: Matthew Baker	Assigned ALJ: Sasha Goldberg

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	SPD-26, Adopting Performance Metrics and Wildfire Mitigation Plan Requirements
--	--

**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:	None	
2. Other specified date for NOI:	None	
3. Date NOI filed:	Concurrent with this Request for Compensation (<i>see</i> Attachment 7).	November 14, 2024. Since Resolution (Res.) SPD-26 is not a “formal proceeding,” in which intervenor compensation claims can be filed (<i>see</i> Section 1801.3(a)), GPI, in accordance

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

		with our guidelines ² , has initiated the subject application so that the claim pertaining to Res. SPD-26 can be resolved.
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes, the NOI was filed timely as an attachment to the application consistent with our requirements.
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.22-10-010	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	May 15, 2023	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
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:	R.22-10-010 (<i>see note below</i>)	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	May 15, 2023	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	D.24-08-054	The Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling on GPI’s showing of significant financial hardship issued on May 15, 2023, in R.22-10-010 required GPI to provide additional information to support its statements of significant financial hardship. On June 22, 2023, GPI filed a supplement to their NOI in accordance with the May 15, 2023, ALJ Ruling. D.24-08-054 awarded compensation to GPI in R.22-10-010 and established a finding of significant financial hardship.
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes

² See the Intervenor Compensation Program Guide at 27.

Timely request for compensation (§1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	SPD-26	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	October 18, 2024	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	November 14, 2024	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	INTERVENOR'S COMMENT(S)	CPUC DISCUSSION
Line 9	The May 15, 2023, ALJ Ruling on GPI's NOI in R.22-10-010 requested additional financial information before making a finding of "significant financial hardship." On June 22, 2023, GPI submitted the requested additional information in our filed Supplement to the NOI. Decision D.24-08-054 made the final determination.	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
	(Please note that Attachment 2 includes a list of issue areas and GPI Pleadings relevant to this Claim.)	Noted
1. WMP Performance Metrics and WMP Requirements GPI has been involved in the development of performance metrics and WMP guidelines since the inception of the WMPs. We were heavily involved in the development of SPD-3, the current performance metrics document, and SPD-14, the most recent update (statute requires annual updates). On March 4, 2024, OEIS issued a solicitation for public input for the update of performance metrics for the next round of the	Resolution SPD-26 Energy Safety does not recommend any changes to the performance metrics for the forthcoming Base Guidelines (2026-2028 WMP Cycle) at this time. Energy Safety made significant updates to the performance metrics during the first year in the three-year WMP cycle (2023-2025). Retaining the existing performance metrics, approved by the Commission in Resolution SPD-3, will allow for consistent data reporting across Wildfire Mitigation	Noted; however, all the references that GPI provides here only points to the Resolution's summary of GPI's comments. A mere reference to or summary of your own comments within the Resolution does not establish that

WMPs, which will be filed in 2025. The solicitation states: “The Office of Energy Infrastructure (Energy Safety) is developing the next iteration of its Wildfire Mitigation Plan (WMP) guidelines. These guidelines will provide guidance to electrical corporations for the 2026-2028 WMP, which will be submitted in 2025. Energy Safety is therefore seeking written public comment on improvements to the guidelines. [OEIS Solicitation, 3/4/24, pg. 1.]” GPI responded to this solicitation with the submission of comments on 4/5/24 (<i>see</i> Attachment 2). Our comments offered a variety of proposed improvements to the established performance guidelines (SPD-3) and WMP requirements. OEIS gave serious consideration to GPI’s and other parties’ proposed improvements, but in the end decided, in the interest of consistency between the current and forthcoming cycles of the WMPs, to forgo making any changes to the existing performance metrics or WMP requirements. GPI made a substantial contribution to SPD-26 and the underlying OEIS document, <i>2024 Review of Performance Metrics for Electrical Corporations and Additional Requirements for Wildfire Mitigation Plans</i>, by providing OEIS with a menu of possible upgrades to the current performance metrics and WMP requirements, in response to a request for ideas for upgrades. The decision by OEIS to maintain the current guidelines without changes clearly benefited from being able to consider a broad range of	Plan cycles. [<i>2024 Review of Performance Metrics for Electrical Corporations and Additional Requirements for Wildfire Mitigation Plans</i>, Sept. 2024, pg.2.] Energy Safety does not plan to include any new WMP requirements in its Base WMP Guidelines. Consequently, Energy Safety does not recommend any changes to the WMP requirements at this time. [<i>2024 Review of Performance Metrics for Electrical Corporations and Additional Requirements for Wildfire Mitigation Plans</i>, Sept. 2024, pg.3.] Pleadings The introduction to GPI’s 4/5/24 Comments reads as follows: GPI provides comments on the following topics and recommendations regarding the WMP guideline documents listed in the <i>Soliciting Public Input for Next Iteration of WMP Guidelines</i> request for comment: 1. Process Development: Establish a process that provides transparency into OEIS Staff proposals and internal OEIS developments. 2. Process Development: Establish a WMP Development Track to address more complex WMP development and standardization issues. 2.1. Integrate more readily implementable and straight forward WMP method alignment measures in the 2026-2028 WMP Technical Guidelines. 2.2. Scope the development of longer-term and/or more complex	those comments were considered, adopted, or relied upon, either in whole or in part. The Resolution itself does not acknowledge that GPI’s comments influenced its final decision.
---	--	---

improvements as proposed by GPI and other parties. It may be possible to interpret the intervenor compensation statutes (PUC §1801 - §1812) in such a way as to conclude that with a decision to make no changes to the guidelines document, no intervenor can be considered to have made a substantial contribution to the Decision. This interpretation should be resisted. A long-established tenet of the Commission's intervenor compensation program is that an intervenor can make a substantial contribution to a Decision even if the Decision does not adopt the intervenor's position, as long as the position supplements and enriches the record underlying the Decision. This is clearly the case here. Our efforts were both solicited by and used by the OEIS in their deliberations. As such, our efforts deserve to be compensated, despite the absence of language in the Decision linking directly to GPI's (or any other intervenor's) comments. The OEIS carefully weighed each proposed upgrade against the value of maintaining total comparability between the 2023-2025 and 2026-2029 WMP cycles by maintaining the existing guidance documents. This determination could not have been made with the same level of confidence without the benefit of having a comprehensive menu of possible upgrades to consider. We also note that our proposed upgrades will remain on the record, available to be adopted the next time that OEIS decides to update the guidelines. GPI's substantial contribution is unquestionable.	standardization efforts in a separate WMP development track. 2.3. Map existing relationships between the OEIS managed WMP, active CPUC proceedings, and legislative actions. 3. Maturity Model and Survey: Validate, update, and assess the operationalization value of the Maturity Model Survey. 3.1. Issue a maturity model survey summary for IOUs and SMJUs as a separate element of the annual WMP cycle, ~1 month following the Utility Survey response filing deadline, but prior to public comment deadlines. 3.2. Include a validation and verification assessment of the Maturity Model Survey that includes a review of Utility self-scoring responses. 3.3. Conduct a comprehensive review of Maturity Model Survey question design and response formats that informs a revision process. 3.4. Report the basis for quantitative Maturity Survey targets and or update targets to reflect current field-specific capabilities. 3.5. Revise maturity model survey questions and scoring methods that can conflate utility preparedness and/or that do not apply to some utilities. 3.6. Identify critical path capabilities and prioritize foundational capabilities. 4. WMP Process and Evaluation Guidelines: Establish transparent	
---	---	--

	and measurable thresholds for WMP Approval/Denial. 4.1. Score WMPs on a graded scale. 6. 2026-2028 Base WMP Technical Guidelines: Require Utilities to report (i) annual tree removal data, (ii) percent of VM residues removed from worksites, and (iii) whether/when vegetation management residues are diverted to end-use pathways. 7. 2026-2028 Base WMP Technical Guidelines: Require IOUs to report on planning risk model outputs for the entirety of the distribution and transmission systems and leverage existing public web-based platforms with downloadable data and public access capabilities. 8. GPI recommends near-term and medium-term actions to advance planning standard transparency and development, respectively. 8.1. 2026-2028 Base WMP Technical Guidelines (Near-term): Require Utilities to identify when and how risk modeling outputs are applied. 8.2. WMP Development Track (Mid-term): Formally identify the need to establish a top-down risk tolerance planning standard/threshold and/or any conversion methods necessary to relate existing model output capabilities to an adopted planning standard. Identify the agency under whose jurisdiction this falls. [GPI Comments, 4/5/24, pgs. 1-2.]	
--	--	--

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?	Yes	Verified
c. If so, provide name of other parties: TURN, Mussey Grade, PAO, the IOUs, and the SMJUs.		Noted
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: This proceeding covers a wide variety of topics related to the state's program for wildfire mitigation. The Green Power Institute has been an active participant in the Commission's RPS and LTPP/IRP proceedings and a number of related proceedings, including the wildfire mitigation proceeding, R.18-10-007. The Green Power Institute coordinated its efforts in this proceeding with other parties in order to avoid duplication of effort, including participating in monthly zooms organized by Cal Advocates for parties to coordinate their efforts, and in numerous phone calls with other parties, especially Mussey Grade, TURN, and Cal Advocates. These bilateral contacts were conducted on an ad hoc basis as various issues came up. We have added significantly to the outcome of the Commission's deliberations through our own unique perspective. Some amount of duplication has occurred in this proceeding on all sides of contentious issues, but Green Power avoided duplication to the extent possible, and tried to minimize it where it was unavoidable.		Noted

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

	CPUC DISCUSSION
a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness: The GPI is providing, in Attachment 2, a listing of the single pleading we provided in this Proceeding in the Wildfire Safety Division that is relevant to matters covered by this Claim, and in Attachment 3, a detailed breakdown of GPI staff time spent for work performed that was directly related to our substantial contributions to Resolution SPD-26. The hours claimed herein in support of Resolution SPD-26 are reasonable given the scope of the Proceeding, and the strong participation by the GPI. GPI staff maintained detailed contemporaneous time records indicating the number of hours devoted to the matters settled by this Decision in this case. In preparing Attachment 3, Dr. Morris reviewed all of the recorded hours devoted to this proceeding, and included only those that were reasonable and contributory to the underlying tasks. As a result, the GPI submits that all of the hours included in the attachment are reasonable and should be compensated in full.	After the adjustments made to this claim, the remainder of the claimed costs are reasonable. <i>See</i> Part III.D.

Dr. Morris is a renewable energy analyst and consultant with more than 40 years of diversified experience and accomplishments in the energy and environmental fields. He is a nationally recognized expert on biomass and renewable energy, climate change and greenhouse-gas emissions analysis, integrated resources planning, and analysis of the environmental impacts of electric power generation. Dr. Morris holds a BA in Natural Science from the University of Pennsylvania, an MSc in Biochemistry from the University of Toronto, and a PhD in Energy and Resources from the University of California, Berkeley. Dr. Morris has been actively involved in electric utility restructuring in California throughout the past three-and-a-half decades. He served as editor and facilitator for the Renewables Working Group to the California Public Utilities Commission in 1996 during the original restructuring effort, consultant to the CEC Renewables Program Committee, consultant to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research on renewable energy policy during the energy crisis of 2000-2001, and has provided expert testimony in a variety of regulatory and legislative proceedings, as well as in civil litigation. Dr. Harrold has worked for the Green Power Institute (GPI) for a total of more than 10 years, as a Research Assistant from 2006 to 2008, and again as a Scientist from 2015 to present. Through her work with the GPI she has been engaged with the development of the Renewable Portfolio Standard program (RPS), the Integrated Resources Planning (IRP) proceeding, and the Wildfire Mitigation Plan (WMP) proceeding. Dr. Harrold earned a Ph.D. in geomicrobiology from the University of Washington, Department of Earth and Space Science in 2014. Decision D.98-04-059 states, on pgs. 33-34, "Participation must be productive in the sense that the costs of participation should bear a reasonable relationship to the benefits realized through such participation ... At a minimum, when the benefits are intangible, the customer should present information sufficient to justify a Commission finding that the overall benefits of a customer's participation will exceed a customer's costs." This proceeding is concerned with the development and approval of the wildfire mitigation plans of the wires utilities. The cost reductions and environmental benefits of the WMPs overwhelm the cost of our participation.			
b. Reasonableness of hours claimed: The GPI made Significant Contributions to Resolution SPD-26 by actively participating in workshops and working groups, and providing a thoughtful and detailed reply to a solicitation from OEIS on the topics that were under consideration in the Proceeding and are covered by this Claim. Attachment 3 provides a detailed breakdown of the hours that were expended in making our Contributions. The hourly rates and costs claimed are reasonable and consistent with awards to other intervenors with comparable experience and expertise. The Commission should grant GPI's claim in its entirety.	After the adjustments made to this claim, the remainder of the claimed hours are reasonable. <i>See</i> Part III.D.		
c. Allocation of hours by issue: <table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="203 1661 857 1690">1. WMP Performance Metrics and WMP Requirements</td><td data-bbox="971 1661 1040 1690">100%</td></tr> </table>	1. WMP Performance Metrics and WMP Requirements	100%	Noted
1. WMP Performance Metrics and WMP Requirements	100%		

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
G. Morris	2024	5.50	\$505.00	See comment 1	\$2,778.00	0.00 [4]	\$475.00 [1]	\$0.00
Z. Harrold	2024	33.75	\$340.00	See comment 2	\$11,475.00	16.87 [4]	\$260.00 [2]	\$4,386.20
Subtotal: \$14,253.00						Subtotal: \$4,386.20		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
G. Morris	2024	9.00	\$252.50	½ 2024 rate	\$2,273.00	5.00 [3]	\$237.50 [1]	\$1,187.50
Subtotal: \$2,273.00						Subtotal: \$1,187.50		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$16,525.00						TOTAL AWARD: \$5,573.70		
*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’s records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award. **Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate								

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

ATTACHMENT OR COMMENT #	DESCRIPTION/COMMENT
Attachment 1	Certificate of Service
Attachment 2	Allocation of effort by issue, list of pleadings
Attachment 3	Breakdown of hourly efforts by issue category
Attachment 4	Resolution SPD-26

³ Attachments not included in the final Decision.

Attachment 5	OEIS solicitation for public input
Attachment 6	GPI 4/5/24 Comments to OEIS
Attachment 7	NOI
Comment 1	The Commission has adopted a 4.07 percent for converting 2023 rates to 2024 values. This value can be found on the Escalation tab of the Hourly Rate Chart spreadsheet on the Commission's web site. We apply the 4.07 percent escalator to the approved 2023 hourly rate for Dr. Morris, which is \$485/hr (D.24-04-036), and round to the nearest 5 percent for 2024 per established Commission practice, to produce a rate of \$505/hr.
Comment 2	Dr. Harrold's most recently approved rate is \$250/hr for 2022 (D.24-07-027). D.24-07-027 notes that Dr. Harrold is eligible to move up in 2023 from level 3 to level 4 in the category of Public Policy Analyst. GPI currently has a request for Dr. Harrold's rate as a level 4 for 2023 on file, pending the first Decision rendered that includes hours for Dr. Harrold for 2023. The request is for \$325/hr. If our request is met in full, that would lead to a 2024 rate of 340/hr, applying the 4.07 percent escalator and rounding to the nearest five.

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

On September 16, 2025, a ruling was issued requesting GPI to submit additional information for various claims because the Commission had identified several issues within the claims, including: omission of requested information, unclear or inconsistent details, invoices that did not align with submitted timesheets or hours claimed, invoices that included work unrelated to the claim at issue, making it difficult to determine which rates / hours apply to the specific claim, invoices billed to other entities that did not identify GPI or the consultant, and other inconsistencies that hindered the Commission's ability to evaluate and resolve the claims.

GPI was provided with an opportunity to submit supplemental information, including resumes for all individuals for whom compensation is sought, invoices reflecting the actual billed rates for each consultant (broken down by claim), and consultant agreements for those retained on a contingency basis, where payment of consulting fees is deferred and contingent upon the receipt of an IComp award.

GPI filed its response for supplement information for this proceeding on October 21, 2025, with updated information on December 15, 2025. In its response, GPI confirmed the following:

1. GPI is a program of the Pacific Institute and is not a separate or independent entity and does not conduct business outside of or apart from the Pacific Institute.

2. GPI is a registered fictitious business name of the Pacific Institute and is the renewable energy program of the Pacific Institute.⁴ (However, the Commission notes that this fictitious business name expired in 2018).
3. Gregg Morris' agreement with the Pacific Institute is that when intervenor compensation payments are made to GPI, the Pacific Institute retains their overhead charge and pays the rest to Morris via Future Resources Associates, his dba company.
4. Through Future Resources Associates, Morris pays "practitioners" an initial upfront payment, followed by a second payment once the intervenor compensation award is issued. The specifics of these agreed upon rates and payment terms were filed under seal.
5. GPI states that the remaining award is used to pay the carrying costs of participation in Commission proceedings, the cost of the risk that not all hours in a given claim will be approved for payment, and the salary of Morris.
6. GPI states that Morris works entirely on a contingency basis and does not issue monthly invoices.

We make the following adjustments below based on the information at hand and an assessment of GPI's contribution to the decision.

ITEM	REASON
[1] Gregg Morris' (Morris) 2024 Hourly Rate and Intervenor Compensation Rate	GPI identifies Morris as the director of GPI and confirms that he is not an employee of GPI. Supplemental information confirms that Morris is dba Future Resources Associates, working on a contingency basis for the Pacific Institute, meaning that Morris has agreed to defer his consulting fee contingent upon receipt of this intervenor compensation award. Given this contingency, we utilize the reasonable rates established by Resolution ALJ-393 based on Morris' experience as an Advocate - Executive Director - Level V. The rate range for an Advocate - Executive Director - Level V is \$203.94 - \$477.26 for 2024. Given Morris' experience, we approve an hourly rate of \$475 for 2024. We apply one-half of Morris' adopted 2024 rate of \$475.00 for an Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation rate of \$237.50.
[2] Zoë Harrold' (Harrold) 2024 Hourly Rate	Although GPI continues to identify Harrold as a staff associate of GPI, or a "contract employee," supplemental information provided confirms that Harrold works as a consultant, who in turn bills Future Resources Associates, (not GPI or the Pacific Institute) for work in this proceeding. The Commission requested supplemental documentation be submitted by GPI to confirm the rates charged by Harrold. GPI filed the "Associate

⁴ Public records found at Alameda County Clerk Recorder Office's reflect that fictitious business name Green Power Institute, was active from 6/11/2013 to 6/11/2018 and is currently expired.

	Service Agreement Addendum”⁵ between Future Resources Associates (Morris) and Harrold under seal, but states that per the terms of the contract, Harrold has been hired on a contingency basis, where Harrold receives an initial payment upon invoicing, followed by a second payment contingent upon this intervenor compensation award. Based on these terms, we approve an hourly rate of \$260 for 2023. The rates approved here are specific to work in this proceeding and the contract terms between the consultant and intervenor, as they are established in accordance with the Commission’s policy on consultant compensation, and the understanding that the consultant has not billed or collected full compensation for the work performed until the final award is given. We reiterate that it is the responsibility of the intervenor to be forthcoming about engaging consultants and the terms of the contract, to adhere to the Commission’s policy on compensation for consultant fees, and to provide the appropriate documentation with the initial claim to ensure efficient processing, and thus avoid the need for the Commission to request supplemental documentation. In this instance, GPI did not provide all the documentation pertaining to the contract terms between GPI and Harrold in the initial claim and waited until the Commission requested supplemental documentation, which significantly delayed the processing of this claim.
[3] Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation Hours	GPI claims a total of 9.00 hours for Intervenor Compensation (IComp) Claim Preparation hours in 2024. Given the only hours claimed by GPI was for drafting comments on the 2026-2028 WMP guidelines, we find 5.00 hours for IComp Claim Preparation to be reasonable. Additionally, we note that there were several issues with the claim, including omission of required information, unclear or inconsistent details, and other inconsistencies that hindered the Commission’s ability to evaluate and resolve the claim.
[4] Lack of Substantial Contribution and Internal Duplication	Public Utilities Code §1802(j) states that a substantial contribution “has substantially assisted the commission in the making of its order or decision because the order or decision has adopted in whole or in part one or more factual contentions, legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations presented by the customer.” The courts have addressed the requirement of substantial contribution in, for example, TURN v. CPUC 166 Cal.App. 4th 522 (2008), stating at 11: “[T]o be eligible for compensation, the statute requires that the customer have made a ‘substantial contribution’ to the PUC’s proceedings, as the PUC determines. “‘Substantial contribution’ means that, in the judgment of the commission, the customer’s presentation has substantially assisted the commission in the making of its order or decision....”

⁵ GPI did not provide the existing Associate Services Agreement it references from October 2010 as part of its supplemental documentation. While the Commission will accept the Addendum as a contractual agreement between Future Resources Associates (Morris) and Harrold, for purposes of this proceeding, GPI is reminded that the Commission strictly requires full and accurate disclosure of all information material to request for intervenor compensation.

	In evaluating whether GPI made a substantial contribution here, the Commission evaluates whether the hours claimed were commensurate with the contributions claimed by the intervenor. Making a substantial contribution in and of itself does not entitle an intervenor to all its claimed fees and costs. Compensation is granted for efficient, meaningful contributions. Therefore, we make the following adjustments. Additionally, 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 GPI's claimed hours reflect a significant duplication of effort. Specifically, multiple representatives worked on the same issues and participated in activities where only one representative would have been sufficient, given the relative simplicity or limited scope of the issues involved. <u>Resolution SPD-26:</u> GPI claimed a total of 39.25 hours for their work on Resolution SPD-26. On April 5, 2024, GPI filed comments recommending changes to the WMP requirements, performance metrics, or the Safety Culture Assessment process. This work included reviewing, drafting and editing comments. Although GPI identifies recommendations that it contends were relevant to SPD-26, it does not identify language in the Resolution adopting those recommendations, nor does the Resolution identify GPI's filing as informing the Commission's decision. In the end the Resolution maintained the existing performance metrics and WMP requirements and adopted Energy Safety's proposed Safety Culture Assessment process. The record also reflects substantial overlap between GPI's positions and other parties, including TURN, Mussey Grade Road Alliance, and the Public Advocates Office. GPI acknowledges this overlap but characterizes its participation as providing a "unique perspective." While this may establish that GPI participated, it does not establish that GPI's specific efforts materially assisted the Commission's decision-making process or added any significant additional value. To receive Intervenor Compensation, GPI is required to show how they substantially contributed to the decision-making process. § 1804(c) and Rule 17.4(a).⁶ The Intervenor Compensation Guide (Guide) at 20 states that in Part II.A intervenors "must support each of your claimed contributions with both a citation to the specific portions of documents filed in the proceeding ... and a citation to the specific portion of the CPUC's order or decision indicating that the CPUC has adopted in whole or in part your contentions or recommendations." GPI failed to cite anywhere that Resolution SPD-26 adopted their contentions in full or in part as required by §§1802(j),1803(a), and 1804(c)
--	--

⁶ All rule references are to California Code of Regulations Title 20, Division 1, Chapter 1 unless indicated otherwise.

	and the Guide. Instead, GPI merely references back to its own comments which does not establish that those comments were considered, adopted, or relied upon, either in whole or in part. The Commission gave GPI the benefit of the doubt by reviewing the Resolution and found that GPI was not mentioned once to reference the fact that they filed comments. The resolution makes no acknowledgement that those comments were considered, adopted, or relied upon, either in whole or in part. We note that filing comments alone is insufficient for GPI to receive its full Intervenor Compensation. GPI failed to substantiate how its comments contributed to the decision-making process. Accordingly, we reduce 5.50 hours for Morris and 16.87 hours of Harrold's hours claimed relating to their work on Resolution SPD-26 for its inability to show that all of the hours claimed had a material impact on the Commission's decision-making process. .
[5] Intervenor Responsibility for Transparency and Accuracy in Compensation Requests	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. Intervenor compensation is funded by ratepayers, and the Commission takes seriously any effort to mislead or obscure the financial basis for a claim. We remind intervenors that under Rule 1.1, intent to deceive is not required for a violation, misstatements may still be actionable. Dishonest or misleading claims not only risk denial of compensation but may also subject the intervenor to penalties. 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.
[6] Other Comments	Upon closer review of the Associate Service Agreement Addendum, we find that the compensation GPI is requesting for the consultant's time significantly exceeds the actual rate and compensation the consultant would receive under the contract terms. The Intervenor Compensation Program is funded by ratepayers and is intended to reimburse reasonable costs of participation. As established in D.07-01-009, D.08-04-010, and Resolution ALJ-235, the rate requested by an intervenor must not exceed the actual rate billed by the consultant. Because the consultant has agreed to be paid a percentage of the Commission approved rate and hours, the requested compensation in this claim does not accurately reflect the actual cost of the consultant's services.

	Compensating GPI the full request would result in an overpayment of the consultant's actual fees. GPI also admits that it pays its consultants only a set percentage of the amount it requests from the Commission, and that the remaining portion is used to cover carrying costs, the risk that not all claimed hours will be approved, and Morris' salary. Therefore, in instances where compensation to the intervenor for the consultant's time exceeds the amount the intervenor will actually pay the consultant under their contract terms, the Commission will reduce the award to match the actual cost incurred. While the reductions applied to this claim prevent an overpayment in this instance, we remind GPI that any compensation request for consultant services must strictly align with actual contract terms. Intervenor compensation is intended to cover the true costs of participation and is not a mechanism for generating profit retained by Future Resources Associates (Morris).
Other Comments	The Commission finds the deficiencies in this filing to be concerning and expects a higher standard of transparency and diligence moving forward. The submission was not only missing essential documentation but also contained unclear information regarding consultant terms, missing invoices, or errors throughout. This resulted in inefficient use of the intervenor's own time and an undue burden on Commission staff resources to reconcile these omissions. Please be advised that future claims lacking necessary supporting evidence will be assessed solely on the information provided; if the Commission cannot verify portions of the claim, those portions may be denied ensuring the program operates efficiently for all participants.

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))?	No

GPI filed comments on this proposed decision on August 13, 2026. Some of these comments were broad, general, and addressed twelve other proposed decisions, some of which are not relevant to this proceeding. Under Rule 14.3(c), comments must focus on factual, legal, or technical errors. Accordingly, we address only those portions of GPI's comments that identify claimed errors pertaining to this proceeding.

1. The Governing Legal Standard

GPI comments that it is "Commission practice to give credit to a substantial contribution that enriches the record upon which a Decision was made, regardless of whether it was adopted

by the Commission. An argument that effectively makes the case for a position that the Commission ultimately decides against, thus ensuring that all sides have been fully considered, is absolutely qualified as a substantial contribution. In addition, while the statutes require that an intervenor make a substantial contribution to a Decision, they do not limit compensation to only the hours that linearly led to the substantial contribution.”⁷ GPI goes on to state that “there has been no announcement from the IComp program that its standards for evaluating IComp claims have changed, or that rules are now being interpreted differently than what was done in the past. Therefore, the well-established standards for evaluating IComp claims should be applied to this claim, and most or all of the deductions in hours should be rescinded.”⁸

The Commission confirms that the process for evaluating IComp claims has not changed, nor have the rules governing the IComp program. We reiterate that Pub. Util. Code §1802(j) confirms that a substantial contribution means that the intervenor “has substantially assisted the commission in the making of its order or decision because the order or decision has adopted in whole or in part one or more factual contentions, legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations presented by the customer.” The courts have addressed the requirement of substantial contribution in, for example, *TURN v. CPUC* 166 Cal.App. 4th 522 (2008), stating at 11: “[T]o be eligible for compensation, the statute requires that the customer have made a ‘substantial contribution’ to the PUC’s proceedings, as the PUC determines. ‘Substantial contribution’ means that, in the judgment of the commission, the customer’s presentation has substantially assisted the commission in the making of its order or decision....”

In this decision, the Commission assessed whether GPI’s claimed hours reasonably aligned with the contributions it asserted and made adjustments as appropriate based on its judgment. Pub. Util. Code §1803 states that the “The commission shall award *reasonable* advocate’s fees, *reasonable* expert witness fees, and other *reasonable* costs of preparation for and participation in a hearing or proceeding” to intervenors who have made a substantial contribution. We remind GPI that providing a substantial contribution does not, by itself, guarantee *full* reimbursement of *all* claimed fees and costs. Lastly, we confirm that compensation is awarded for contributions that are efficient and meaningfully advance the Commission’s work, even when the intervenor’s positions are not adopted. As GPI itself notes, a “finding of substantial contribution does not entitle a customer to every claimed hour, and the Commission may reduce hours that are genuinely excessive or unreasonable.”⁹ The Commission has explained that the hours requested by GPI had limited substantive contribution to the decision-making process and did not meaningfully contribute to the outcome of the resolution. Therefore, we make no changes to the decision.

⁷ Comments of the Green Power Institute on the Proposed Decision at 2.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Id.* at 10.

GPI comments that TURN and the Center for Accessible Technology filed comments on July 28 in support of their claim in Rulemaking (R.) 19-09-009 “complaining that improper standards were being imposed.” GPI claims that their comments pertain to this decision as well.¹⁰

The Commission confirms that TURN and the Center for Accessible Technology did not file comments on the proposed decision in this proceeding, but they did file comments in a different proceeding (R.19-09-009). We do not address TURN and the Center for Accessible Technology’s comment here as they do not pertain to this proceeding, but we must correct GPI’s mischaracterization of them. TURN and the Center for Accessible Technology did not indicate that their comments in R.19-09-009 were intended to apply to GPI’s other proposed decisions in other proceedings. Their comments were specific to R.19-09-009; had they intended those comments to apply here, they would have filed comments in this proceeding. Additionally, their comments did not state support for GPI’s claim. Instead, they requested clarification from the Commission that an intervenor may establish substantial contribution when it materially supplements or complements another intervenor’s showing on the same issue, and that an intervenor may receive compensation even if its positions are not adopted, provided the Commission determines that the intervenor made a substantial contribution.¹¹

2. Hourly Rates for Morris

GPI objects to Morris’ 2024 hourly rate of \$475 and argues that it should be increased to the requested rate of \$505.

As stated above, Morris is dba Future Resources Associates, working on a contingency basis for the Pacific Institute, where he has agreed to defer his consulting fee contingent upon receipt of this intervenor compensation award. Given that arrangement, we utilized the reasonable rates established by Resolution ALJ-393 based on Morris' experience as an Advocate - Executive Director - Level V. The rate range for an Advocate - Executive Director - Level V is \$203.94 - \$477.26 for 2024. We uphold Morris’ 2024 hourly rate of \$475 as it already reflects the upper limit for this level. We note that the previously approved rates that GPI references to were approved for a different role. Given Morris’ clarification that he is the director, this is the correct role to be used to establish his rate.

3. Hourly Rates for Harrold

GPI objects to Harrold’s awarded 2024 hourly rate of \$260 and argues that it should be increased to \$340.

We uphold the awarded 2024 hourly rate of \$260 based on the terms outlined in the service agreement filed under seal. This rate is consistent with the Commission’s policy on consultant compensation.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 3.

¹¹ Comments of The Utility Reform Network and Center for Accessible Technology on the Proposed Decision Denying Compensation to Green Power Institute for Lack of Substantial Contribution to Decision 24-11-004 at 2-4.

4. Reduction in Hours

GPI argues that an intervenor need not prevail on every recommendation to make a substantial contribution and may be compensated where its participation assists the Commission, enriches the record, or materially supplements another party's presentation. GPI requests that most or all reductions be rescinded. GPI argues that limiting compensation to contributions explicitly adopted in a decision would undermine the intervenor compensation program and that its historical compensation results show the July 8 proposed decisions depart from longstanding Commission treatment of its claims.¹² More specifically, GPI argues that the Commission cannot reduce an award because a customer's contribution overlapped that of others, maintains that no internal duplication occurred, contends that it deserves credit for its efforts on Resolution SPD-26 despite not being mentioned in the final resolution because it still represents a significant contribution, and objects to the reductions to IComp preparation.¹³

Regarding Resolution SPD-26, GPI does not dispute that the resolution did not expressly adopt its position, either in whole or in part. Nevertheless, GPI offers no evidence demonstrating how it made a substantial contribution to the decision-making process as defined in §1802(j). Although GPI contends that its recommendations were relevant to SPD-26, it does not identify language in the Resolution adopting those recommendations, nor does the Resolution identify GPI's filing as informing the Commission's decision. In the end the Resolution maintained the existing performance metrics and WMP requirements and adopted Energy Safety's proposed Safety Culture Assessment process. We note that the record also reflects substantial overlap between GPI's positions and other parties. Having participated in the proceeding does not establish that GPI's specific efforts materially assisted the Commission's decision-making process. We note that GPI was still awarded compensation for these efforts, though not the full amount requested. And we reiterate that providing a contribution does not, on its own, entitle an intervenor to full reimbursement of all claimed fees and costs. We find the hours awarded here are reasonable and commensurate with the contributions made. Lastly, we note that the Commission considered the scope and supporting documentation for this claim and determined that 5.00 hours constituted reasonable claim-preparation time. Therefore, we make no changes.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Green Power Institute has made a substantial contribution to some aspects of Resolution SPD-26.
2. The requested hourly rates for Green Power Institute's representatives, as adjusted herein, 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.

¹² GPI Comments to Proposed Decision at 8-9, 13.

¹³ *Id.* at 9-13.

3. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$5,573.70.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. Green Power Institute is awarded \$5,573.70.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Liberty Utilities, Bear Valley Electric Service, and PacifiCorp shall pay Green Power Institute 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 are 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 25, 2025, the 75th day after the filing of Green Power Institute's request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. Application 24-11-002 is closed.

This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at Sacramento, California.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	Resolution SPD-26		
Proceeding(s):	A2411002		
Author:	ALJ Sasha Goldberg		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Liberty Utilities, Bear Valley Electric Service, and PacifiCorp		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Green Power Institute	Nov. 14, 2024	\$16,525	\$5,573.70	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
Gregg	Morris	Expert	505	2024	\$475
Zoë	Harrold	Scientist	340	2024	\$260

(END OF APPENDIX)