

Decision 26-09-034 September 3, 2026

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U 338-E) to Establish Marginal Costs, Allocate Revenues, and Design Rates.

Application 24-03-019
Filed March 29, 2024

DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 26-04-033

Intervenor: Center for Accessible Technology	For contribution to Decision (D.) 26-04-033
Claimed: \$41,635.50	Awarded: \$41,635.50
Assigned Commissioner: Karen Douglas	Assigned ALJ: Marcelo Lins Poirier

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	This decision addresses Southern California Edison Company's 2024 General Rate Case Phase 2 proceeding and it approves nine settlement agreements. CforAT's participation was focused on the Residential Rate Design Settlement Agreement, which was one of the nine settlements approved.
--	--

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:	June 3, 2024	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	

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

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
3. Date NOI filed:	July 3, 2024	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:	R.22-11-013	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	June 14, 2023	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	CforAT's most recent ruling on eligible customer status was issued on 6/3/26 in R.24-04-010.	Verified; ruling was issued in R.25-04-010.
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.22-11-013	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	June 14, 2023	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	CforAT's most recent ruling on eligible customer status was issued on 6/3/26 in R.24-04-010.	Verified; ruling was issued in R.25-04-010.
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.26-04-033	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	May 4, 2026	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	June 26, 2026	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
Overview: This Phase 2 General Rate Case broadly addresses SCE's proposals regarding marginal costs, revenue allocation and rate design. CforAT's participation was focused on issues of residential rate design to address issues of concern for our constituency of residential customers with disabilities and medical needs, including affordability and appropriate access to all offered rates. CforAT filed a protest addressing offered testimony on residential rate design issues (accepted into the record as Exhibit CforAT-01 via a ruling issued on October 29, 2025) and was a party to the Residential Rate Design Settlement Agreement submitted via motion on August 12, 2025 and approved in the final decision.	Decision 26-04-033 (the Final Decision) adopts multiple settlements, including the Residential Rate Design Settlement addressing issues of concern to CforAT. The discussion of the Residential Rate Design Settlement is at pages 23-28 of the Final Decision.	Verified
Medical Discount: CforAT calls out the specific issue of the need for addressing the availability of a medical discount for any new opt-in rate because we were the party primarily responsible for consideration of this issue. CforAT addressed SCE's obligation to include a medical discount in any untiered opt-in rate issue in our protest as well	The Final Decision notes the application of the medical discount to any opt-in rate as part of its review of the settlement and confirms that the settlement is reasonable in light of the record, consistent with law and in the public interest. Final Decision at p. 26 (noting the medical discount provision) and at pp. 26-28 (analyzing and adopting the settlement).	Verified

as our testimony. The testimony includes a discussion of discovery conducted by CforAT on this issue, with data requests and responses attached. • CforAT Protest at pp. 2-3 • Exh. CforAT-01 at pp. 1-2 and attached DR responses. Based on CforAT's focus on this issue, the Medical Discount Requirement was addressed in the Residential Rate Settlement.		
Residential Rate Design: In addition to our targeted focus on the medical discount requirement, CforAT participated broadly on issues of residential rate design as reflected in our protest and testimony. This includes record development on the issue of seasonal differentials. <i>See</i> CforAT Protest at pp. 4-5; Exh. CforAT-01 at pp. 2-6 and attached DR responses and additional information. It also includes record development on the issue of SCE's effective CARE discount (raised by SCE in its supplemental testimony). <i>See</i> Exh. CforAT-01 at p. 6. CforAT additionally addressed other issues of residential rate design during the course of the extensive settlement discussions resulting in the Residential Rate Design	As noted in the Final Decision, the Residential Rate Design Settlement Agreement resolves party disputes about multiple items proposed by SCE, including baseline allowances for customers with heat pump water heaters, adjustment of TOU rate differentials, resolution of disputed issues on seasonal differentials (including a specific resolution on the seasonal differential for TOU-D-Prime), confirmation of the availability of the medical discount for all opt-in rate options, and an examination of customer enrollment in the residential heat pump water heater baseline allowance. Final Decision at pp. 23-25. The Final Decision adopts the proposed Residential Rate Design Settlement Agreement without modification, finding that it "is reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with law, and in the public interest." Final Decision at pp. 27-28.	Verified

Settlement Agreement.		
-----------------------	--	--

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	Noted
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Other parties that focused on residential rate design issues and joined the Residential Rate Design Settlement Agreement include Cal Advocates, SEIA and TURN, as well as SCE. In reaching a negotiated resolution of these issues, all interested parties had a shared final position on issues of residential rate design.		Noted
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: CforAT was the only party participating on issues of residential rate design with a specific focus on the interests of residential customers with disabilities and medical needs. While many of the interests of these customers are common to other residential customer groups, CforAT also represented certain unique concerns, such as the availability of a medical discount of all available opt-in rates. Where CforAT's perspective overlapped with those of other consumer advocates and interested parties. CforAT worked effectively and cooperatively to minimize any duplication of effort. To the extent that there was any duplication, it reflects the importance of issues of concern and the need for all interested stakeholders to consider key issues so that parties could reach a negotiated resolution.		Noted

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

	CPUC Discussion
a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness: CforAT's overall cost of participation is reasonable. All residential customers are impacted by the issues of residential rate design that were addressed in this proceeding, and CforAT's constituency of utility customers with disabilities and medical needs share the interests of all	Noted

	CPUC Discussion
residential customers in ensuring that energy bills are affordable, while also facing unique issues such as the availability of medical discounts. While it is difficult to assign a monetary value to CforAT's contributions in this proceeding, CforAT's participation ensured that the interests of our constituency were reflected in SCE's rate designs to be implemented through this GRC cycle. The value of this representation, including the specific issues for medical customers, exceeds CforAT's reasonable cost of participation.	
b. Reasonableness of hours claimed: CforAT's work in this proceeding was led by Legal Director Melissa Kasnitz, who has substantial experience in the area of rate design. Specific tasks, including participation at the PHC and discovery issues, were delegated to junior attorney Rachel Sweetnam, with appropriate supervision by Ms. Kasnitz. This delegation of work achieves overall efficiency due to the lower hourly rate charged for work by Ms. Sweetnam. When work is delegated in this way, it appropriate for the supervising attorney to confer with the junior attorney and otherwise monitor their work; when both attorneys bill time to a task it is not a duplication of effort, but rather effective delegation with supervision. Additionally, CforAT Legal Counsel Paul Goodman attended two settlement meetings when Ms. Kasnitz was unavailable. It is appropriate to have a senior attorney participate in important activities in place of an absent colleague in this context. Overall, CforAT focused our activity specifically on issues relevant to residential rate design, plus modest time spent monitoring the overall course of the proceeding. This targeted focus allowed us to best represent the interests of our constituency while maintaining a limited role in the overall GRC Phase 2 proceeding.	Noted
c. Allocation of hours by issue: Kasnitz Hours – 2024 (12.3 hours total) Discovery: 2.1 hours (17%) The issue area "Discovery" reflects time spent preparing, responding to, and reviewing responses to data requests as part of developing the factual record. While this is identified as a separate issue area, virtually all factual development and discovery conducted by CforAT addressed issues of residential rate design.	Noted

	CPUC Discussion
General Participation: 2.3 hours (19%) The issue area “General Participation” reflects time necessarily spent to monitor and engage with the overall proceeding. This includes time spent at the Prehearing Conference and time spent monitoring activity (including settlements) in areas other than residential rate design. Procedural: 1.5 hours (12%) The issue area “Procedural” reflects time necessarily spent on addressing procedural matters over the course of the proceeding. This includes scheduling issues, issues of case management, and other activities required by the Commission for the effective management of the proceeding. Res Rates: 6.4 hours (52%) The issue area “Res Rates” reflects time spent developing CforAT positions on the pending residential rate design proposals and developing the factual record to address these issues. The time includes developing testimony, reviewing other party testimony relevant to residential rate design issues, and otherwise ensuring that the needs of our constituency of residential customers with disabilities and medical needs are appropriately represented. Sweetnam Hours – 2024 (8.1 hours total) Discovery: 5.8 hours (72%) General Participation: 2.3 hours (28%) Kasnitz Hours – 2025 (32.3 hours) Discovery: 2.2 hours (7%) General Participation: 2.1 hours (6.5%) Procedural: 2.1 hours (6.5%) Res Rates: 9.5 hours (29%) Settlement: 16.4 hours (51%) The issue are “Settlement” reflects time spent participating in settlement efforts and the presentation of the residential rate settlement before the Commission for review. The vast majority of this time is associated with the development and adoption of the residential rate design settlement, but it also includes a limited number of hours reviewing other settlements presented to the Commission.	

	CPUC Discussion
Goodman Hours – 2025 (2.0 hours) Settlement: 2.0 hours (100%) Sweetnam Hours – 2025 (2.6 hours) Settlement: 2.6 hours (100%) Kasnitz Hours – 2026 (1.1 hours) Res Rates: 0.8 hours (73%) General Participation: 0.3 hours (27%)	

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	2024	12.3	\$735	D.24-10-028	\$9,040.50	12.3	\$735	\$9,040.50
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2025	32.3	\$755	D.25-10-060	\$24,386.50	32.3	\$755	\$24,386.50
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2026	1.1	\$780	See comment below	\$858.00	1.1	\$780 [1]	\$858.00
Paul Goodman	2025	2.0	\$680	See comment below	\$1,360.00	2.0	\$680 [2]	\$1,360.00
Rachel Sweetnam	2024	8.1	\$240	D.25-04-041	\$1,944.00	8.1	\$240	\$1,944.00
Rachel Sweetnam	2025	2.6	\$275	D.25-10-050	\$715.00	2.6	\$275 [3]	\$715.00
Subtotal: \$ 38,304.00						Subtotal: \$38,304.00		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2024	1.0	\$367.50	½ standard rate	\$367.50	1.0	\$367.50	\$367.50

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2026	7.6	\$390.00	½ pending rate	\$2,964.00	7.6	\$390 [1]	\$2,964.00
Subtotal: \$3,331.50						Subtotal: \$3,331.50		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$41,635.50						TOTAL AWARD: \$41,635.50		
*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. 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		
Paul Goodman		2002		219086		No		
Rached Sweetnam		2023		350075		No		

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	Detailed Time Records (including time on merits and on compensation issues)
	2026 Kasnitz Rate and 2025 Goodman Rate: At the time of filing, the Commission has not formally adopted a 2026 rate for Ms. Kasnitz or a 2025 rate for Mr. Goodman. However, a pending proposed compensation decision in A.23-11-002, which is set to be addressed at the Commission's upcoming voting meeting on July 2, 2026, would set both of these rates at the rates requested here, namely \$780 for Ms. Kasnitz in 2026 and \$680 for Mr. Goodman in 2025.

² This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <https://apps.calbar.ca.gov/attorney/LicenseeSearch/QuickSearch>.

³ Attachments not attached to final Decision.

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
[1] Kasnitz's 2026 Hourly Rate	D.26-07-022 adopted a 2026 hourly rate of \$780.00 for Kasnitz, which we apply here.
[2] Goodman's 2025 Hourly Rate	D.26-07-022 adopted a 2025 hourly rate of \$680.00 for Goodman, which we apply here.
[3] Sweetnam's 2025 Hourly Rate	CforAT cited D.25-10-050 as its basis for Sweetnam's 2025 hourly rate of \$275.00. However, that decision does not adopt an hourly rate for Sweetnam. D.25-10-060 adopted a 2025 hourly rate of \$275.00 for Sweetnam, which we apply here.

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

- Center for Accessible Technology has made a substantial contribution to D.26-04-033.
- The requested hourly rates for Center for Accessible Technology's representatives are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
- The claimed costs and expenses are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
- The total of reasonable compensation is \$41,635.50.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

- 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 \$41,635.50.
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 September 9, 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 September 3, 2026, at Sacramento, California.

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

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:	D2609034	Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2604033		
Proceeding(s):	A2403019		
Author:	ALJ Poirier		
Payer(s):	Southern California Edison Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Center for Accessible Technology	June 26, 2026	\$41,635.50	\$41,635.50	N/A	N/A

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$735	2024	\$735
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$755	2025	\$755
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$780	2026	\$780
Paul	Goodman	Attorney	\$680	2025	\$680
Rachel	Sweetnam	Attorney	\$240	2024	\$240
Rachel	Sweetnam	Attorney	\$275	2025	\$275

(END OF APPENDIX)