

Decision 26-10-071 October 29, 2026

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company to Recover in Customer Rates the Costs to Support Extended Operation of Diablo Canyon Power Plant from January 1 through December 31, 2026, and for Approval of Planned Expenditure of 2026 Volumetric Performance Fees (U39E).

Application 25-03-015
(File March 28, 2025)

**GRANTING COMPENSATION TO CALIFORNIANS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY
FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO D.25-12-007**

Intervenor: Californians for Renewable Energy, Inc. (CARE)	For contribution to Decision (D.) 25-12-007
Claimed: \$7,707.50	Awarded: \$7,652.50
Assigned Commissioner: Karen Douglas	Assigned ALJ: Jack Chang

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	<p>Approves Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E's) 2026 Diablo Canyon Power Plant extended operations revenue requirement of \$382.233 million. The revenue requirement is allocated to PG&E, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company using the allocation factors 44.19 percent, 45.86 percent, and 9.95 percent, respectively. Also approves PG&E's Volumetric Performance Fees spending plan and addresses other matters relating to Diablo Canyon.</p>
--	--

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:	5/30/25	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	6/19/25	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:	D.24-12-2024	D.24-12-024
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	12/5/24	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	Decision 24-12-024 December 5, 2024	Noted
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:	D.24-12-2024	D.24-12-024
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	12/20/2024	12/05/2024
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	Decision 24-12-024 December 5, 2024	Noted
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.25-12-007	D.25-12-007
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	12/09/2025	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	2/7/2026	02/09/2026
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

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

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
<p>1. The Decision finds that CARE and other intervenors “raise legitimate concerns that PG&E may be recovering, in this application, overspending on DCPD transition and renewal costs in excess of the \$1.4 billion DWR loan”. (page 25)</p> <p>The Decision also states that “the parties appropriately raise questions as to whether PG&E’s reprioritization of transition and renewal funds might be improperly shifting those costs to the current application as funding for DCPD extended operations.”</p> <p>Based on these concerns, the Decision requires PG&E, in future Diablo Canyon cost recovery proceedings, to “disclose whenever any transition and license renewal costs that were part of the amounts included in the TLRES are proposed for recovery in any future DCPD forecast proceedings for DCPD extended operations, along with explanations for why those costs were originally proposed as transition and license renewal costs and why those costs are now eligible for recovery for extended</p>	<p>D.25-12-007, pages 25-26, 77-78, Ordering Paragraph 5.</p>	<p>Verified</p>

operations.” (pages 25-26)		
<p>2. CARE identified several VPF projects that warrant CPUC approval. CARE-01 Pages 10-14</p> <p>CARE-01 Page 13 Reliability Battery Project</p> <p>CARE-01 Page 13 Emergency Water Heating Replacement</p> <p>Renewable Energy Activities CARE-01 Page 11</p>	<p>The Commission determines that PG&E’s VPF spending plan application is consistent with Pub. Util. Code Section 712.8(s)(1) requirements. Decision Page 66</p>	Verified
<p>3. CARE identified \$19,439,401 of O&M expenses that were incurred before November 2, 2024 and did not meet PG&E’s or the CPUC’s definition of extended operations costs. CARE-01 CARE Application for Rehearing. page 4, CARE Opening Brief Page 12</p>	<p>Included in CARE’s Request for reconsideration Page</p>	Verified
<p>4. CARE identified that PG&E did not meet all the requirements of D.23-12-036 and D.24-12-033 Reply Testimony Page 5,6 CARE Opening Brief Page 20,21</p>	<p>EPUC and CARE write that PG&E has not complied with CPUC directives to explain why it did not seek government funding for DCPD costs. Decision Page 75 Additionally, as discussed earlier, PG&E minimally complies with requirements in D.24-12-033 that it explain why it did not seek government funding for project costs in excess of \$1 million requested for recovery from ratepayers, or was otherwise unable to anticipate the need for the investments and activities at the time government funding was being requested. Decision Page 76</p>	Verified

5. CARE's testimony proposed lowering the revenue requirement by returning the interest on the liquidated damages to ratepayers account potentially saving ratepayers millions of dollars as waiting to provide the interest on the liquidated damages account in 20230 will dilute the value due to inflation.	Decision ignores CARE's opportunity to save millions of dollars for ratepayers	Verified, in part. The Decision at 66 states, "CARE makes a similar argument stating: Utilizing the VPF funds to lower the revenue requirement is equitable to all the utilities and the ratepayers."
6. CARE provided a list of cancelled projects from the 2020 general rate case several of which PG&E is now seeking ratepayer funding for. CARE-01 page 26	Decision ignores 2020 project list and fails to comment on it.	Verified
7. CARE opposed PG&E initial request for a fixed management fee as exorbitant CARE-01-page 4 Opening Brief Page 13 The commission required PG&E to recalculate the fee. (Decision Page 6) See:ALJ Ruling Directing Filing of Additional Information on October 8, 2025, pages 2-3.	Decision Page 6 "A subsequent ALJ Ruling was issued on September 25, 2025 ordering PG&E to provide more detail about how it calculated the 2026 fixed management fee using the escalation factor methodology authorized in D.24-12-003 and the data it used to calculate that 2026 fixed management fee as well as its reasons for proposing a new methodology for calculating the 2026 fixed management fee compared to the methodology authorized in D.24-12-033.	Verified
8. CARE extensively chronicled recommendations from the DCISC on project upgrades proposed by PG&E which the DCISC recommends approval of. CARE-01, CARE-03, CARE-05 The Decision claims that DCISC made no recommendations.	Included in CAREs Rehearing Request.	Verified
9. CARE's Testimony challenged PG&E's RA substitution amounts and supported using the	The Decision approves the use of the revised RA MPB to calculate substitution capacity costs and takes note of the	Verified

methodology derived in D.25-06-049 CARE-01 page 6,7	“substantial modifications to the RA MPB methodology” adopted in D.25-06-049 that lowered the requested Diablo Canyon revenue requirement by almost \$28 million. D.25-12-007, pages 44-45	
--	--	--

B. Duplication of Effort (§ 1801.3(f) and § 1802.5):

	Intervenor’s Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Public Advocate’s Office of the Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding?	YES	Yes
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Yes
c. If so, provide name of other parties: A4NR, WEM		Noted; other parties include TURN and SBUA
d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication: Our Approach to interest on Liquidated Damages Account was supported by WEM, WEM also supported the DCISC recommendations analyses. A4NR had similar claims on O&M expense largely based on PMO++ program while CARE relied on PG&E’s 2020 capital project cancellation list and DCISC’s recommendations to complete project detailed by PG&E		Noted

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

	CPUC Discussion
a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness: CARE’s participation was effective in causing the Commission to require PG&E to detail in future proceedings to identify cost that were reimbursed by DWR loan, CARE identified over 19 million dollars that were incurred prior to November 2, 2024 that should not have been paid by ratepayer funding. CARE supported the RA substitution factor from D.25-06-049. CARE’S request was modest compared to other intervenors.	Noted
b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:	Noted

	CPUC Discussion
CARE only claimed minimal amounts of compensation compared to the actual time CARE spent on this proceeding. CARE identified substantial savings for ratepayers but the commission ultimately gave in to PG&E on all issues. CARE claimed no compensation request for issue 3,5,and 6.	
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 638 Minute 1 75 Minutes 2 325 Minutes 3 0 4 65 Minutes 5 0 6 0 7 20 Minutes 8 650 Minutes 9 40 Minutes <p><u>Issues</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 General 1 The Commission determines that PG&E's VPF spending plan application is consistent with Pub. Util. Code Section 712.8(s)(1) requirements. 2 The Commission determines that PG&E's VPF spending plan application is consistent with Pub. Util. Code Section 712.8(s)(1) requirements. 3 CARE identified \$19,439,401 of O&M expenses that were incurred before November 2, 2024 4 CARE identified that PG&E did not meet all the requirements of D.23-12-036 and D.24-12-033. 5 CARE provided a list of cancelled projects from the 2020 general rate case 6 CARE opposed PG&E initial request for a fixed management fee as exorbitant. 7 CARE extensively chronicled recommendations from the DCISC on project upgrades proposed by PG&E which the DCISC recommends approval of. 8 CARE's Testimony challenged PG&E's RA substitution amounts and supported using the methodology derived in D.25-06-049. 	Noted

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
[Expert 1] ²	2025	30.5	230.00	D.25-10-024	\$7,015.00	30.50	\$240.00 [2]	\$7,320.00
Subtotal: \$ ³						Subtotal: \$7,320.00		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Robert Sarvey	2025	4.5	115.00	D.25-10-024	\$517.50	2.0 [3]	\$120.00 [2]	\$240.00
Michael Boyd	2025	2.0	87.50	D.25-10-024	\$175.00	1.00 [3]	\$92.50 [1]	\$92.50
Subtotal: \$7,707.50						Subtotal: \$332.50		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$ ⁴						TOTAL AWARD: \$7,652.50		
<p>*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.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate</p>								

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service

² CARE identified Expert 1 as Robert Sarvey in a confirmation submitted through the IComp Coordinator inbox in response to IComp staff's request for this information on 09/29/2026.

³ Subtotal was left blank by the intervenor.

⁴ Total Request was left blank by the intervenor.

⁵ Attachments not included in the final Decision.

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
[1] Micheal Boyd 2025 Hourly Rate	D.25-10-024 approved a 2025 hourly rate of \$185.00 for Boyd. As Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation hours are compensated at half the preparer's standard hourly rate, we apply the rate of \$92.50 for Boyd.
[2] Robert Sarvey 2025 Hourly Rate	D.25-10-024 approved a 2025 hourly rate of \$240.00 for Sarvey. As Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation hours are compensated at half the preparer's standard hourly rate, we apply the rate of \$120.00 for Sarvey.
[3] Incomplete Claim Preparation: Appendix & Missing Dollar Amounts Claimed	<p>We find that time records submitted by CARE do not provide time spent on Intervenor Compensation (IComp) claim preparation.</p> <p>Time records for each individual included in the Claim must be provided and must chronologically list the following information about each task included in the records: 1) Date when the specific task was performed, 2) The issue in the proceeding that the task addressed (as identified in the Scoping Memo or by the ALJ), 3) Description of the specific task, 4) Amount of the time spent on the task (in hours or hour fraction). See IComp Program Guide at 25.</p> <p>Additionally, CARE did not complete several sections of the claim including the Findings of Fact, Ordering Paragraph, and Appendix; and the total dollar amount requested in Part III.B was left blank. Claim preparation hours include the completion of all sections required to be completed by the intervenor. IComp staff also had to contact CARE to clarify the identity of Expert [1] in Part III.B, as the expert was not clearly identified in the claim or timesheet. CARE confirmed the identity of the expert on October 5, 2026 as Robert Sarvey. Lastly, the ICOMP hours requested here are excessive given the narrow scope of the issues and level of CARE's participation. Accordingly, we adjust the award for IComp preparation hours based on the time records provided, incompleteness of the claim, and excessiveness. We reduce the 2.5 hours claimed in Sarvey's 2025 IComp preparation hours, and we reduce the 1.00 hours claimed in Boyd's 2025 IComp preparation hours.</p>

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))?	Yes

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. CALifornians for Renewable Energy, Inc. has made a substantial contribution to D.25-12-007.
2. The requested hourly rates for CALifornians for Renewable Energy, Inc. representatives, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$7,652.50.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. CALifornians for Renewable Energy, Inc. is awarded \$7,652.50.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall pay CALifornians for Renewable Energy 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 April 25, 2026, the 75th day after the filing of CALifornians for Renewable Energy'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 October 29, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

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

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:	D2610071	Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2512007		
Proceeding(s):	A2503015		
Author:	ALJ Jack Chang		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company		

Intervenor Information⁶

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
CAlifornians for Renewable Energy, Inc.	02/09/2026	\$7,705.50	\$7,652.50	N/A	N/A

Hourly Fee Information⁶

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Michael	Boyd	Advocate	\$175.00	2025	\$185.00
Robert	Sarvey	Advocate	\$230.00	2025	\$240.00

(END OF APPENDIX)

⁶ The Intervenor Information and Hourly Fee Information were left blank by CARE and were filled out by the Commission.