

Decision 26-09-036 September 3, 2026

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Establish Policies, Processes, and Rules to Ensure Safe and Reliable Gas Systems in California and Perform Long-Term Gas System Planning.	R.24-09-012 (Filed September 26, 2024)
---	---

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO UTILITY CONSUMERS' ACTION
NETWORK COMPENSATION FOR
SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 25-12-042**

Intervenor: Utility Consumers' Action Network	For contribution to Decision (D.) 25-12-042
Claimed: \$11,421.88	Awarded: \$9,698.75
Assigned Commissioner: Karen Douglas	Assigned ALJ: Andrew Dugowson ¹

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	D.25-12-042 designates initial priority neighborhood decarbonization zones, as required by Public Utilities Code Section 662(a)
--	---

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812²:

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	1/9/2025	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	2/10/2025	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes

¹ ALJ Andrew Dugowson was assigned to R.24-09-012 on March 10, 2026.

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

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
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.23-12-008	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	June 18, 2025 ³	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.23-12-008	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	June 18, 2025 ⁴	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.25-12-042	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	December 23, 2025	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	February 23, 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
Issue: Initial Priority Neighborhood Decarbonization Zones		

³ R.23-12-008, Ruling (June 18, 2025),
<https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M570/K195/570195865.PDF>.

⁴ *Ibid*.

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
UCAN recommended a more compressed and reasonable deadline extension than the extension proposed by PG&E. “The IOUs should be required to update their maps with the PNDZs by January 16, 2026.4 PG&E requested a deadline of 45 days after the final decision for the IOUs to update their maps. However, the statutory deadlines dictate that the schedule remain as compressed as possible. Thus, the maps should be updated no later than January 16, 2024.” UCAN Reply Cmts (12/8/25) p. 1.	The Commission agreed with UCAN. “UCAN supports extending the deadline from the 15 days described in the proposed decision but recommends a deadline of January 16, 2026, because “the statutory deadlines dictate that the schedule remain as compressed as possible... We agree with UCAN that such a lengthy extension is unreasonable because of SB 1221’s statutory deadlines and the need to make information available to the public in a timely manner. Therefore, we extend the deadline to January 16, 2026.” D.25-12-042 p. 42	Verified
UCAN emphasized the importance of community support. “[T]he key consideration for successful pilots is to run the pilots in neighborhoods supportive of full electrification.” UCAN Cmts (12/3/25) p. 4. “The PD also ensures that the pilots have the highest likelihood of success by prioritizing decarbonization zone selection in areas with local support from government entities and other stakeholders. For these reasons, UCAN supports the PD’s initial selections regarding decarbonization zones.” UCAN Cmts (12/3/25) p. 3.	The Commission’s decision aligned with UCAN’s recommendation. “Based on these requests and the methodology described in this decision, we increased the number of initial decarbonization zones to 151... Where cities and organizations expressed support for tracts already included in Appendix A, we added them to the list of requesters... To enable the designation of decarbonization zones in California’s non-coastal regions, such as the mountains and Central Valley, more local governments and community organizations must indicate their availability.” D.25-12-042 pp. 43,44.	Verified

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
UCAN supported regular updates to the zone determinations. “UCAN’s opening comments strongly supported future updates to the PNDZs. Several other parties requested that the Commission update the PD to include specific scheduled updates for the PNDZs. UCAN agrees and recommends that the Commission establish quarterly updates to the PNDZs, but at a minimum, biennial updates... UCAN requests the Commission solicit feedback for updated zone designations prior to each PD so that every decision in this proceeding has the record needed to update the decarbonization zones” UCAN Cmts (12/8/25) p. 2.	The decision aligns with UCAN’s recommendation noting that zones will be updated in the future. “Given the iterative nature of SB 1221 implementation and our intention to update the zone criteria, we decline to commit to specific decarbonization zone designations or a detailed process at this time. However, we clarify that the intent behind the April 1, 2026 Report directed by this decision is to enable an update to the decarbonization zones concurrently with the establishment of the Pilot Program. If circumstances preclude an update at that time, we commit to updating them by December 31, 2026.” D.25-12-042 p. 52.	Verified
UCAN advocated against the Advice Letter process for updates. “UCAN opposed PG&E’s request that the gas IOUs be allowed to update the PNDZs through Tier 1 advice letters.⁷ If the Commission granted PG&E’s request, then the gas IOUs could effectively ignore the PNDZs by submitting Tier 1 advice letters for each location where the gas IOUs would like to propose a pilot. Such a system would make the Commission-selected PNDZs meaningless. The Commission-selected PNDZs serve an	The Commission agreed with UCAN. “We also decline to allow Gas Corporations to update decarbonization zones through the Advice Letter process in this decision. Section 662(d) requires the public to have an opportunity to comment on updates to the decarbonization zones.” D.25-12-042 p. 52.	Verified

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
important role, to focus the IOUs' proposals within areas most likely to house successful pilots" UCAN Cmts (12/8/25) p. 2.		
Issue: Communication and Education		
UCAN provided legal and cost-based arguments for updating the community education component of the utilities' outreach, including limiting the outreach to one virtual information session per utility. UCAN Cmts (12/3/25) p. 7.	The Commission agreed with UCAN. "Based on party comments, we modify the proposed decision to direct that Gas Corporations appropriately target community outreach to government and tribal representatives, community organizations, and electric utilities in a manner that does not result in unreasonable costs. Specifically, to reduce the cost of community education, we require each Gas Corporation to host one virtual information session within its service territory... Gas Corporations shall also record the information session and post the link to the recording on their SB 1221 websites within five days. The Commission will also post a link to the information sessions on its SB 1221 website." D.25-12-042 pp. 48-49.	Verified
UCAN supported a date certain for the PAO fact sheet and opposed the Sempra utilities' assertion that the utilities should have editorial control over the fact sheet. UCAN Reply Cmts (12/8/25), Section II, p. 2.	The Commission agreed with UCAN. "While UCAN supports PG&E's request for a date-certain deadline for the fact sheet's completion, it opposes the recommendation that utilities review the fact sheet. [citation omitted] According to UCAN, the Commission may determine what information the Gas Corporations must supply to gas customers. [citation omitted] We agree. While we can commit to completing the fact sheet by January 15, 2026, we will not provide it for utility or	Verified

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
	community partner review. The fact sheet is a Commission product.” D.25-12-042 p. 53.	

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, Sierra Club, NRDC		Noted
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: UCAN is the only consumer advocate representing the interests of San Diego Gas and Electric residential ratepayers that provided comments to the Commission on the memorandum account issue covered in this compensation request (the other intervenors are in the Bay Area). In this proceeding UCAN has made several unique contributions. For example, regarding information on this decision, UCAN was the only party to reference cost and communication standards established in the Legislature's Ratepayer Protection Act of 2025. With that as a basis, UCAN made several arguments regarding customer communications. Several of UCAN's recommendations were incorporated into the final decision. UCAN also provided the Commission with a unique analysis of the decarbonization zones (UCAN comments on 12/3/25, Fig 1, p. 4). UCAN was able to provide a unique perspective and evidence that added to the record. UCAN's work aided the Commission's analyses and discussions in reaching its decision. UCAN urges the Commission to find any duplication of effort minor and therefore reasonable. The Commission should find that UCAN's participation, to the extent duplication occurred, served to supplement, complement, or contribute to the showing of the other intervenor. And consistent with such a finding, the Commission should determine that UCAN's work is compensable consistent with the conditions set forth in Section 1802.5.		Noted

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

	CPUC Discussion
a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness: UCAN used a single attorney and a single expert in this proceeding. In doing so, UCAN was able to minimize coordination and maximize its ability to efficiently address the issues within the proceeding. While the dollar amount of UCAN’s contributions are difficult to quantify because the memorandum account will be evaluated in the future. UCAN successfully argued for a customer communications process that the decision noted would reduce ratepayer costs. ⁵ UCAN urges the Commission to find the cost of its participation reasonable.	Noted
b. Reasonableness of hours claimed: UCAN only researched and commented on issues on which the Commission requested feedback. UCAN further restricted itself to sub-issues that are within its expertise and that affect residential customers. UCAN spent the minimum number of hours needed to address the issues in the proceeding. UCAN urges the Commission to find the hours spent providing successful analyses and arguments reasonable.	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: 54%, Issue 1: Initial Priority Neighborhood Decarbonization Zones 46%, Issue 2: Communication and Education	Noted

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Edward Lopez	2025	2.5	\$485	See Comment 1	\$1,212.50	2.00 [3]	\$485.00 [1]	\$970.00
Tyson Siegele (Expert)	2025	24.5	\$360	D.25-12-014 ⁶	\$8,820.00	22.00 [3]	\$355.00 [2,5]	\$7,810.00
Subtotal: \$10,032.50						Subtotal: \$8,780.00		

⁵ D.25-12-042, p. 48, (“Specifically, to reduce the cost of community education, we require each Gas Corporation to host one virtual information session within its service territory.”).

⁶ D.25-12-014, at 16,

<https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Published/G000/M590/K650/590650560.PDF>.

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Edward Lopez	2026	1.75	\$247.5	½ 2026 rate request; See Comment 1	\$433.13	1.50 [4]	\$247.50 [1]	\$371.25
Tyson Siegele	2026	5.1	\$187.5	½ 2026 rate request; See Comment 2	\$956.25	3.00 [4]	\$182.50 [2,5]	\$547.50
Subtotal: \$1,389.38						Subtotal: \$918.75		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$11,421.88						TOTAL AWARD: \$9,698.75		
*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 ⁷		Member Number		Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation		
Edward Lopez		12/20/1991		157052		No		

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III:⁸

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Attachment #1	Certificate of Service
Attachment #2	Agreement between UCAN and UCAN's consultant Mr. Siegele.
Comment #1 Rate	Edward Lopez Hourly Rate Justification 2025: UCAN requests a 2025 rate for Mr. Lopez of \$485.

⁷ This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <https://apps.calbar.ca.gov/attorney/LicenseeSearch/QuickSearch>.

⁸ Attachments are not included in the final Decision.

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Escalation Request for Edward Lopez	This rate is derived by applying the proper escalation rate of 3.46% for 2025, as published by the Commission in the 2025 version of the hourly rate chart for intervenor compensation (see https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/-/media/cpucwebsite/divisions/administrative-law-judge-division/documents/icompmaterials/hourlyratechart-02132025.xlsm). The resulting 2025 rate is \$491.44 rounded up to the nearest \$5, equals \$495. [\$475 x 1.0346 = \$491.44 rounded up to the nearest \$5 increment = \$495]. The CPUC approved rate category for Mr. Lopez is “Advocate – Executive Director – V.” Because rate for the category is capped at \$488 for 2025, UCAN requests the highest \$5 increment within the rate category of \$485 instead of the calculated escalation of \$495. 2026: UCAN requests a 2026 rate for Mr. Lopez of \$495. This rate is derived by applying the proper escalation rates of 3.35% for 2026, as published by the Commission in the 2026 version of the hourly rate chart for intervenor compensation (see https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/-/media/cpuc-website/divisions/administrative-law-judge-division/documents/icompmaterials/hourlyratechart-02102026.xlsm). The resulting 2026 rate is \$501.24 rounded up to the nearest \$5, equals \$505. [\$485 x 1.0346 = \$501.244 rounded up to the nearest \$5 increment = \$505]. The CPUC approved rate category for Mr. Lopez is “Advocate – Executive Director – V.” Because rate for the category is capped at \$499 for 2026, UCAN requests the highest \$5 increment within the rate category of \$495 instead of the calculated escalation of \$505.
Comment #2 Tyson Siegle (Expert) Rate Justification	Tyson Siegle Hourly Rate Justification Mr. Siegle has been recognized as an expert before the Commission in numerous proceedings. See below for Commission-approved rate for 2025. In this request, UCAN requests a 2026 rate of \$375 for Mr. Siegle. See below for the rate calculation. 2025: CPUC-approved rate for Mr. Siegle, \$360 in D.25-12-014: https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Published/G000/M590/K650/590650560.PDF 2026: UCAN requests a 2026 rate for Mr. Siegle of \$375.

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	This rate is derived by applying the proper escalation rates of 3.35% for 2026, as published by the Commission in the 2026 version of the hourly rate chart for intervenor compensation (see https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/-/media/cpuc-website/divisions/administrative-law-judge-division/documents/icompmaterials/hourlyratechart-02102026.xlsm). The resulting 2026 rate is \$372.06 rounded up to the nearest \$5, equals \$375. [\$360 x 1.0335 = \$372.06 rounded up to the nearest \$5 increment = \$375]. The CPUC-approved rate category for Mr. Siegle is “Expert – Not Otherwise Classified – V” (D.25-03-028). The requested rate of \$360 remains within the 2026 range for this category. Note: Mr. Siegle is a consultant to UCAN. The agreement between Mr. Siegle and UCAN is Attachment #2.

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
[1] Lopez’s 2025 and 2026 Hourly Rates	D.26-05-027 adopted a 2025 hourly rate of \$485.00 for Lopez, which we apply here. We apply the 2026 escalation factor of 3.35% from Resolution ALJ-393 to Lopez’s 2025 hourly rate of \$485.00 to come to an hourly rate of \$501.25. However, the maximum 2026 hourly rate for Lopez’s classification of Advocate – Executive Director – Level V is \$499.30. We therefore adopt a 2026 hourly rate of \$495.00 for Lopez as it is the highest five-dollar increment below the maximum allowable rate. We apply one-half of Lopez’s 2026 hourly rate of \$495.00 for a 2026 Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation Rate of \$247.50.
[2] Siegle’s 2025 and 2026 Hourly Rate	UCAN has confirmed that Tyson Siegle is a consultant. Pursuant to Commission policy, the rate requested by an intervenor must not exceed the rate billed to that intervenor by any outside consultant it hires, even if the consultant’s billed rate is below the floor for a given experience level.⁹ Per the IComp Program Guide at 24, the Commission may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award.¹⁰

⁹ D.07-01-009, D.08-04-010, and Resolution ALJ-235.

¹⁰ § 1804(d).

Item	Reason
	UCAN has confirmed that per the terms of their contract, Tyson Siegele has been hired on a contingency rate basis, meaning that Tyson Siegele has agreed to defer the 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 Tyson Siegele's experience as an Expert – Not Otherwise Classified - V. Given that the 2025 rate range for Expert – Not Otherwise Classified – Level V is \$264.22 to \$401.60, we find a 2025 hourly rate of \$355.00 to be reasonable and we adopt it here. Given that the 2026 rate range for Expert – Not Otherwise Classified – Level V is \$275.06 to \$412.44, we find a 2026 hourly rate of \$365.00 to be reasonable and we adopt it here. We take one-half of Siegele's 2026 rate for an Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation rate of \$182.50. The award determined herein for Tyson Siegele's contribution in this proceeding shall be paid in full to Tyson Siegele, and no portion of this part of the award shall be kept by UCAN. Additionally, 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 compensation for the work performed until the final award is given.
[3] Excessive Time Claimed Preparing Reply Comments on the Proposed Decision	The length of a document does not always indicate its depth, substance, and impact. The reductions made here are not based on the length of the document, but due to inefficiencies and the excessive time spent producing it. Excessive is when the Commission determines that the time claimed is disproportionate to the reasonable amount of effort required for that contribution. Furthermore, the burden of proof is on the intervenor to show that each of the hours claimed was spent productively to make a substantial contribution to the decision. In this instance failed to prove that. UCAN requested 11.25 hours to produce roughly four pages in its Reply Comments on the Proposed Decision. We find that an excessive amount of time given the experience of UCAN and its representatives. Accordingly, we reduce 3.00 hours from UCAN's claimed time on this document, which breaks down as follows: • Lopez: 0.50 hours • Siegele: 2.50 hours
[4] Excessive Time Spent Preparing	UCAN claimed 6.85 hours for preparation of the intervenor compensation request. While the claim was detailed, organized, and generally compliant with

Item	Reason
Claim for Intervenor Compensation	Commission requirements, we find the preparation hours excessive given the scope of issues and overall scale of the request. UCAN and its representatives Lopez and Siegele have significant experience practicing before the Commission and preparing similar claims, and we would expect greater efficiency in compiling this request. Additionally, UCAN did not provide a rationale explaining why this particular claim—smaller in scale than some of their previous submissions—required this level of effort. Accordingly, we adjust the claimed hours to 4.50 hours for claim preparation. This adjustment better reflects the complexity and scale of the request.
[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. Although no violation of Rule 1.1 has been found in this instance, 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. Intervenor 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 (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	Yes

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Utility Consumers' Action Network has made a substantial contribution to D.25-12-042.
2. The requested hourly rates for Utility Consumers' Action Network'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.
3. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$9,698.75.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. Utility Consumers' Action Network is awarded \$9,698.75.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Gas Company, and Southwest Gas Corporation shall pay Utility Consumers' Action Network their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional gas revenues for the 2025 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. If such data are unavailable, the most recent 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 May 9, 2026, the 75th day after the filing of Utility Consumers' Action Network'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:	D2609036	Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2512042		
Proceeding(s):	R2409012		
Author:	ALJ Andrew Dugowson		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Gas Company, and Southwest Gas Corporation		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Utility Consumers' Action Network	February 23, 2026	\$11,421.88	\$9,698.75	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
Edward	Lopez	Attorney	\$485	2025	\$485.00
Edward	Lopez	Attorney	\$495	2026	\$495.00
Tyson	Siegele	Expert	\$360	2025	\$355.00
Tyson	Siegele	Expert	\$375	2026	\$365.00

(END OF APPENDIX)