Decision 26-09-020 September 3, 2026

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Petition to Adopt, Amend, or Repeal a Regulation Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code §1708.5	Petition 23-06-018

DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO GREEN POWER INSTITUTE FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 23-12-010

Intervenor: Green Power Institute	**For contribution to** D.23-12-010
Claimed: $ 32,253[1]	**Awarded:** $6,670.00
Assigned Commissioner: Karen Douglas	**Assigned ALJ:** Syche Cai

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	D.23-12-010 denies the Petition to open a new proceeding and closes the proceeding.

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812[2]:

	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:	July 28, 2023	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes. Because no Prehearing Conference was held in this proceeding, the timeliness of the Notice of Intent

[1] The correct amount claimed is $32,252.50.

[2] All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

		(NOI) is governed by the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rule) 17.1(a)(3). Under this Rule, an NOI may be filed any time after the start of the proceeding and up to 30 days after the deadline for filing responsive pleadings. The first response in this proceeding was filed on July 20, 2023. GPI filed its NOI on July 28, 2023, which is within 30 days of the time for filing responsive pleadings. Accordingly, GPI's NOI is timely.
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):	D.23-11-036	Not verified. D.23-11-036 referred to the earlier findings, pursuant to the rebuttable presumption rule of §1804(b)(1) and did not make an independent finding on the

		customer status pursuant to § 1802(b)(1)(C). Those findings have long expired (see §1804(b)(1)).
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.20-05-002	R.22-10-010
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	November 20, 2020	Not verified. The most recent finding of significant financial hardship was made in D.24-08-054, as adopted by the Commission in R.22-10-010.
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	D.23-11-036	Not verified. D.23-11-036 referred to the earlier findings, pursuant to the rebuttable presumption rule of §1804(b)(1) and did not make an independent finding on the significant financial hardship pursuant to § 1802(h) or §1803.1(b). The most recent finding of significant financial hardship was made in D.24-08-054, as adopted by the

		Commission in R.22-10-010.
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.23-12-010	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	December 14, 2023	December 15, 2023
15. File date of compensation request:	January 19, 2024	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
	(Please note that Attachment 2 includes a list of issue areas and GPI Pleadings relevant to this Claim.)	Noted
1. Petition is Riddled with Scientific Errors. The GPI made substantial contributions to Decision D.23-12-010 by providing detailed analysis and insights into the scientific underpinning of Petition P.23-06-018. The Petition questions, in particular, research that was performed by GPI and relied on in the development of the Environmental Performance Standard, D.07-01-039. GPI's Response to the Petition debunked the scientific misrepresentations in the Petition, and demonstrated that the EPS was and is based on a solid scientific foundation. The Commission acknowledged and accepted our description of the science	**Pleadings** In this Response we demonstrate that the Petition is riddled with errors of all varieties: conceptual confusions, inappropriate selection of systems and data, misreadings and misrepresentations of literature, improper calculation procedures, and untenable assumptions and contentions. When the effects of the most important and easily corrected errors are removed, the Petition's scientific conclusions change drastically and the case for opening a new proceeding collapses. [Response, 7/20/23, pg. 1.] The carbon emissions calculations in the 1989 and 2000 reports are based on calculations from first principles, not on the use of emissions factors reported in the literature. [Response, 7/20/23, pg. 7.]	Noted, however the decision does not mention GPI other than the fact that they filed comments, which aligned with many other party positions including the Agricultural Energy Consumers Association, the California Farm Bureau Federation, Shell Energy, the Bioenergy Association of California, the Independent Energy Producers

behind the EPS, which represents a significant substantial contribution to Decision D.23-12-010.	It was entirely proper for the Commission to take the actions that were taken in the development of the EPS rules, including adopting the biomass exemption for qualifying fuels. The exemption was founded on a solid record. [Response, 7/20/23, pg. 3.] The Petition asserts that published scientific research has debunked the claim that thinning is an effective wildfire risk operation. It may be true that there are some published papers that claim that thinning does reduction not reduce wildfire risks, but these sources are well outside of the mainstream. By no means have thinnings and other forest treatment operations been debunked as effective tools in wildfire risk reduction. On the contrary, thinning is one of the key tools available to land managers that can be used to make forests more wildfire resilient. [Response, 7/20/23, pg. 13.]	Association, and the Rural County Representatives of California.
2. Need to Calculate Net Emissions. The GPI made substantial contributions to Decision D.23-12-010 by providing commentary and insights into the scientific underpinning of the net emissions approach to analyzing the greenhouse-gas implications of biomass energy production, an approach that was developed by the GPI and has been accepted by the scientific community. The Petition acknowledges the imperative to perform a net analysis, but repeatedly ignores this imperative and simply presents information about smokestack emissions at a	**Pleadings** The Petition acknowledges that SB 1386 directs that the EPS consider the "net emissions" of biomass power production. From a methodological perspective this is the most basic form of lifecycle emissions accounting for biomass energy production. However, even while acknowledging the need to perform net emissions accounting, the Petition repeatedly ignores net emissions accounting and instead focuses on comparing emissions at the smokestack of biomass generators with the emissions at the smokestack of fossil fuel generators, which is directly contrary to the specifications in SB 1386 and contrary with accepted analytical methodology. [Response, 7/20/23, pg. 5.]	Noted, however the decision does not mention GPI other than the fact that they filed comments, which aligned with many other party positions including the Agricultural Energy Consumers Association, the California Farm Bureau Federation, Shell Energy, the Bioenergy Association of California, the

biomass power plant. The Commission acknowledged the need to understand biomass emissions on a net basis, which represents a significant substantial contribution to Decision D.23-12-010.		Independent Energy Producers Association, and the Rural County Representatives of California.
3. Timeframes of Analysis. The GPI made substantial contributions to Decision D.23-12-010 by debunking the notion that the GPI reports that were relied on in the formulation of the biomass exemption in the EPS used inappropriate timeframes. In fact, the GPI reports were based on a dynamic analysis that does not depend on the arbitrary selection of an analytical timeframe. Our discussion of timeframes provided a substantial contribution to the record underlying Decision D.23-12-010.	**Pleadings** The Petition asserts: "Morris uses time frames of 50 and 100 years for calculating net biomass emissions (pg. 17)." This statement is both incorrect and misleading, and indicates a fundamental misunderstanding of the analytical methodology that was employed in the 1989 and 2000 studies. The 2000 study conducted a dynamic analysis of the emissions of both biomass energy production and the various alternative fates for the biomass fuels that are used in California. In a dynamic analysis there is no need to choose a timeframe for the analysis. [Response, 7/20/23, pg. 9.]	Noted, however the decision does not mention GPI other than the fact that they filed comments, which aligned with many other party positions including the Agricultural Energy Consumers Association, the California Farm Bureau Federation, Shell Energy, the Bioenergy Association of California, the Independent Energy Producers Association, and the Rural County Representatives of California.
4. California Biomass Policy. The GPI made substantial contributions to Decision D.23-12-010 by debunking the notion that the biomass exemption in the EPS is contrary to overall state energy and environmental policies. In fact, the GPI demonstrated that the EPS exemption is very much in concert with	**Pleadings** We have also demonstrated that the Petition's policy claims are not in concert with state policy, and in fact would interfere with a variety of state policies and programs designed to mitigate climate change and achieve other objectives. It is the Petition, not the EPS biomass exemption that is untethered from state laws and policy. [Response, 7/20/23, pg. 18.]	Noted, however the decision does not mention GPI other than the fact that they filed comments, which aligned with many other party positions including the Agricultural

California policy, which supports biomass energy production as a means to cut air pollution from open burning of agricultural and forestry residues, reduce the amount of organics buried in the state's landfills, and support efforts to reduce wildfire risks in the state's forests. Our discussion of state policy towards biomass energy production provided a substantial contribution to the record underlying Decision D.23-12-010.		Energy Consumers Association, the California Farm Bureau Federation, Shell Energy, the Bioenergy Association of California, the Independent Energy Producers Association, and the Rural County Representatives of California.
5. Conclusion – Deny Petition. The GPI made a substantial contribution to Decision D.23-12-010 by pointing out that opening a new proceeding as suggested in the Petition would not be a wise use of Commission or Parties' resources. The Decision agreed with our assessment, denied the Petition, and closed the proceeding.	**Decision D.23-12-010** Opening a new rulemaking to address biomass EPS rules now may be duplicative and lead to inefficient use of Commission resources and place an unreasonable burden on other stakeholders and potential participants (D.23-12-010, Finding of Fact, pg. 9). **Pleadings** As we argued in our response to the Petition: … We strongly question whether the effort rises to the top of the Commission's priorities … The PD concludes its discussion thusly: "Opening a new rulemaking to address biomass EPS rules now would be an inefficient use of Commission resources and an unreasonable burden on other stakeholders and potential participants (PD, pg. 8)." We agree. [Comments on the PD, 11/28/23, pg. 1.]	Noted, however the decision does not mention GPI other than the fact that they filed comments, which aligned with many other party positions including the Agricultural Energy Consumers Association, the California Farm Bureau Federation, Shell Energy, the Bioenergy Association of California, the Independent Energy Producers Association, and the Rural County Representatives of California.

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?	No	Verified
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Verified
c. If so, provide name of other parties: California Forestry Assoc., California Farm Bureau, Bioenergy Assoc. of CA, PG&E, Shell, IEP		Verified
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: This proceeding covers a wide variety of topics related to biomass energy production in California. 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 greenhouse gas proceeding that produced the emissions performance standard, R.06-04-009. The Green Power Institute coordinated its efforts in this proceeding with other parties in order to avoid duplication of effort, and 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 pleadings we provided in this Proceeding that are 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 Decision D.23-12-010. The hours claimed herein in support of Decision D.23-12-010 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. Dr. Morris is a renewable energy analyst and consultant with more than 40 years of diversified experience and accomplishments in the energy and environmental	After the adjustments made to this claim, the remainder of the claimed costs are reasonable. *See* Part III.D.

<table>
<tr><td>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 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 years, and has provided expert testimony in a variety of regulatory and legislative proceedings, as well as in civil litigation.

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 biomass energy production in California. The cost reductions and environmental benefits of biomass overwhelm the cost of our participation.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:

The GPI made Significant Contributions to Decision D.23-12-010 by providing a detailed Response to the Petition that was under consideration in the Proceeding and is covered by this Claim. The Petition directly called out the contributions by GPI to the 2007 Decision that the Petition sought to revise, so GPI had to address multiple references in the Petition. 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 the GPI’s claim in its entirety.</td><td>After the adjustments made to this claim, the remainder of the claimed hours are reasonable. See Part III.D.</td></tr>
<tr><td>c. Allocation of hours by issue:

1. Petition is Riddled with Scientific Errors 40%
2. Need to Calculate Net Emissions 18%
3. Timeframes of Analysis 9%
4. California Biomass Policy 18%
5. Conclusion – Deny Petition 15%</td><td>Noted; totals 100%.</td></tr>
</table>

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Total $**
G. Morris	2023	62.50	485	See comment 1	30,313[3]	12.5 [1]	$460.00 [3]	$5,750.00
					Subtotal: $30,313[4]			***Subtotal: $5,750.00***
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Hours**	**Rate**	**Total $**
G. Morris	2023	8.00[5]	242.5	½ 2023 rate	1,940	4.00 [2]	$230.00 [3]	$920.00
					Subtotal: $1,940			***Subtotal: $920.00***
					TOTAL REQUEST: $32,253[6]			***TOTAL AWARD: $6,670.00***

*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.

**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:[7]

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Attachment 1	Certificate of Service

[3] GPI's correct total for attorney, expert, and advocate fees is $30,312.50. We remind GPI to not round their request to the nearest dollar amounts.

[4] GPI's correct subtotal for attorney, expert, and advocate fees is $30,312.50. We remind GPI to not round their request to the nearest dollar amounts.

[5] Per GPI's time records, Morris spent a total of 8 hours on Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation between 2023 and 2024 (6 hours in 2023 and 2 hours in 2024).

[6] GPI's correct total request is $32,252.50. We remind GPI to not round their request to the nearest dollar amounts.

[7] Attachments not included in the final Decision.

Attachment 2	Allocation of effort by issue, list of pleadings
Attachment 3	Breakdown of hourly efforts by issue category
Comment 1	The Commission has adopted a 4.46 percent adjustment for rates in the Market Rate Study for converting the 2022 to 2023 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 4.46 percent escalator to the approved 2022 hourly rate for Dr. Morris, which is $465/hr (D.23-11-036), and round to the nearest 5 percent for 2023 per established Commission practice, to produce a rate of $485/hr.

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 14, 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.[8] (However, the Commission notes that this fictious 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. 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.

---

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

Item	Reason
[1] Lack of Substantial Contribution	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…." 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. GPI claims a total of 62.50, or $5,750.00 in 2023 which is excessive for its contribution to D.23-12-010, which consisted of one set of comments to the Petition and one set of comments to the proposed decision. We find this excessive given the lack of substantial contribution made here. The decision only acknowledges that GPI was one of many parties that opposed the Petition. Additionally, any comments that GPI made were noted as being like those of the Agricultural Energy Consumers Association, the California Farm Bureau Federation, Shell Energy, the Bioenergy Association of California, the Independent Energy Producers Association, and the Rural County Representatives of California. In the end, the decision denied the Petition because the Commission determined that opening a new rulemaking was not the appropriate vehicle, and that these concerns could be taken up in the existing Integrated Resource Planning proceeding. The decision explains the full basis for denying the Petition, and none of the reasons cited relate to GPI's comments or positions. GPI's only meaningful contribution here was its opposition to opening a new rulemaking, rather than its "scientific information." The decision neither acknowledged the specific arguments raised by GPI nor indicated that GPI's points were unique from those of other parties or had a distinct impact on the Commission's decision-making process. We conclude that the decision would have reached the same conclusion with or without GPI's contribution which provided no significant additional value in assisting the Commission. For these

	reasons, we reduce the claimed hours by 80% for excessiveness and lack of substantial contribution.
[2] Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation Hours	Per GPI's time records, Morris spent a total of 8 hours on Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation between 2023 and 2024 (6 hours in 2023 and 2 hours 2024). We find the hours submitted by GPI to be unreasonable and excessive given the scope of issues and overall scale of the request. Hours claimed must be reasonable, productive, effective, and efficient. Accordingly, we reduce the claimed 2023 hours by 2.00 hours and the 2024 hours by 2.00 hours.
[3] Morris' 2023 Hourly 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 -387 and Resolution ALJ-393 based on Morris' experience as an Advocate - Executive Director - Level V. The rate range for an Advocate - Executive Director - Level V for 2023 is $191.49 - $464.81. Given Morris' experience, we approve an hourly rate of $460 for 2023. We apply one-half of Morris' adopted 2023 rate of $460.00 for an Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation rate of $230.00. Because no hours are awarded in 2024, we do establish a 2024 rate.
[4] 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.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS
Within 30 days after service of this Claim, Commission Staff or any other party may file a response to the Claim (*see* § 1804(c))

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	No

B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (*see* Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	No

GPI filed comments on this proposed decision on July 15 and amended comments on August 7, 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."[9] 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."[10]

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

[9] Comments of the Green Power Institute on the Proposed Decision at 2.
[10] *Id*. at 2-3.

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."[11]

2. Reduction in Hours

GPI objects to the reductions in hours for work om the Petition, arguing that it was the only party that supplied technical or scientific information, and that this information informed the decision making in this Petition, even if it wasn't explicitly discussed in the Decision.[12]

The Commission assessed GPI's substantial contribution by examining whether the hours claimed were proportional to the value of the contributions provided. GPI requested 62.50 hours, or $5,750 for Morris' work on this issue where their only substantive contribution was its opposition to opening a new rulemaking. Additionally, any comments that GPI made were noted as being like those of other parties without providing any significant additional value in assisting the Commission. In the end, the Commission denied the Petition because the Commission determined that opening a new rulemaking was not the appropriate vehicle. The reason for the denial was not due to GPI's "highly technical scientific information that demonstrated that the scientific information presented in the Petition was seriously flawed."[13] We again remind GPI that making a contribution, by itself, does not entitle an intervenor to all its claimed costs. We find that the hours awarded here are reasonable and proportionate to the contributions provided. Therefore, we make no changes to the decision.

3. Hourly rates for Morris

GPI objects to Morris' 2023 hourly rate of $460 and argues that it should be increased to the requested rate of $485.

---

[11] *Id.* at 7.
[12] *Id.* at 7-8.
[13] *Id.* at 8.

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 for 2023 is \$191.49 - \$464.81. We maintain Morris 2023 hourly rate of \$460 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. Therefore, we make no changes to the decision.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Green Power Institute has made a substantial contribution in some aspects to D.23-12-010.

2. The requested hourly rates for Green Power Institute's representative, 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 \$6,670.00.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. Green Power Institute is awarded \$6,670.00.

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, and Southern California Gas Company shall pay Green Power Institute their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric and gas revenues for the 2023 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. If such data is unavailable, the most recent electric and gas 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 April 3, 2024, the 75th day after the filing of Green Power Institute's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. Petition 23-06-018 is closed.

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:	D2609020	Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2312010		
Proceeding(s):	P2306018		
Author:	ALJ Syche Cai		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Gas Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Green Power Institute	Jan. 19, 2024	$32,253[14]	$6,670.00	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	$485	2023	$460.00

(END OF APPENDIX)

[14] The correct amount requested is $32,252.50.