Decision 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 (U-39E).	Application 25-03-015

GRANTING COMPENSATION TO WOMEN'S ENERGY MATTERS FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 25-12-007

Intervenor: Women's Energy Matters	**For contribution to Decision (D.) 25-12-007**
Claimed: $34,629.75	**Awarded:** $30,560.75
Assigned Commissioner: Karen Douglas	**Assigned ALJ:** Jack Chang

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	D2512007 approves a revenue requirement of $382,233,000 for PG&E's 2026 Diablo Canyon Power Plant extended operations, which is allocated to PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E using the allocation factors 44.19 percent, 45.86 percent, and 9.95 percent, respectively. The Decision also approves PG&E's volumetric performance fees spending plan for the January 1 to December 31, 2026 period.

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812[1]:

	Intervenor	**CPUC Verification**
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	May 30, 2025	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:		

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

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
3. Date NOI filed:	June 26, 2025	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:	A2403018	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	June 27, 2025	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:	A2403018	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	June 27, 2025	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:	D2512007	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	December 9, 2025	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	February 5, 2026	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
12	WEM filed its NOI on June 26, 2025, including a showing of significant financial hardship and request for ruling on same. Then, on June 27, 2025 (one day after WEM's NOI was filed), ALJ Atamturk issued a ruling finding that WEM had demonstrated significant financial hardship in proceeding A2403018, which represents a rebuttable presumption.	Verified.

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
1. <u>General:</u> WEM was an active party to the proceeding, including working with other parties to identify issues, attending hearings, and filing briefs and comments. Early on, WEM stated that its focus would be the reasonableness of PG&E's 2026 revenue request, given that PG&E has exhausted the government funds that were to pay Diablo Canyon extended operations transition costs, and is now shifting costs to the Diablo Canyon Extended Operations Balancing Account (DCEOBA) that legally must be tracked to the Diablo Canyon Transition and Relicensing Memorandum Account (DCTRMA), (and thus not eligible to be paid by ratepayers). *See* e.g.: "An initial review of PG&E's Application and Party Protests and Responses, reveals that PG&E's is again attempting to charge ratepayers for costs that by law must be paid via government funding streams. If government funding streams have run dry, the law clearly prohibits PG&E from shifting transition costs onto ratepayers …" *WEM Motion for Party Status, May 27, 2025, pp. 1-2.* "MERRIGAN: Women's [WEM's] concern is -- …what are our options, as ratepayer advocates, and what are the CPUC's options [if] … this proceeding turned up evidence that government funding streams cannot cover all the …	The Docket of this proceeding confirms WEM's active participation, as does the Decision itself at pp. 5, 7, 77. WEM's early efforts working with other parties, including PG&E, to identify disputed issues (as directed by the July 2, 2025 Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling), is documented by the *Joint Meet and Confer Report, d. August 28, 2025*. Quotes and citations from D2512007 evidencing WEM's specific substantial contributions are included below.	Verified

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
transition costs that are legally required to be paid by government funds." *Transcript of May 30, 2025 Pre-Hearing Conference, p. 28:17-22.* WEM's substantial contributions to D2512007 are further documented below.		
2. *WEM's Opening and Reply Briefs presented analysis of the record showing PG&E's 2026 Diablo Canyon revenue request shifts transition (DCTRMA) costs onto ratepayers by re-characterizing DCTRMA costs as extended operations costs and moving them into the DCEOBA.* *See:* "The record contains evidence that PG&E's 2026 Diablo Canyon revenue request includes costs which, without a doubt, should be paid through government funding streams, but PG&E has instead tracked them to the DCEOBA, labeling them as operating expenses to be paid by ratepayers." *WEM Opening Brief, October 1.2025, p. 3.* WEM contrasted CARE and A4NR's detailed testimony on this issue, with PG&E's light dismissal of same. *See WEM Opening Brief, pp. 3-7.* WEM provided original analysis showing that the DWR review process established by SB846 does not review PG&E's DCEOBA	The Decision references and validates WEM's work challenging PG&E's assertion that all project expenses in its 2026 forecast qualify as expenses to be recorded in the DCEOBA: *From D2512007:* "As discussed in the following section, CARE, WEM, A4NR, TURN, EPUC, and SBUA challenge several aspects of this assertion by PG&E." *D2512007, p. 15.* "WEM cites arguments made by CARE and A4NR about projects identified by the PMO++ and the DCISC reports, writing that '[t]he record contains evidence that PG&E's 2026 Diablo Canyon revenue request includes costs which, without a doubt, should be paid through government funding streams, but PG&E has instead tracked them to the DCEOBA, labeling them as operating expenses to be paid by ratepayers.' Additionally, WEM argues that the DWR review process established by SB 846 only reviews Diablo Canyon expenses record in the DCTRMA and does not examine the costs	Verified

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
costs to *see* if they might rightfully belong in the DCTRMA: "The DWR review process examines costs PGE has labeled as transition costs, i.e, the costs PG&E contends are eligible for reimbursement from the DWR loan. It reviews DCTRMA costs and approves these DCTRMA costs ae eligible for government funding. It does not examine the costs that PGE has tracked to the DCEOBA (to *see* if they might rightfully belong in the DCTRMA). It is this proceeding that must examine all 2026 costs that PGE has tracked in the DCEOBA. … If PGE has incorrectly – whether inadvertently, or with malicious intention -- entered transition costs into the DCEOBA, then the CPUC must call out the error and hold PG&E accountable." *WEM Opening Brief, p. 9.* In its Reply Brief, WEM reviewed and analyzed diverse statements made by PG&E witness Brian Ketelsen regarding transition costs, to point out deceptive word play that would re-classify transition costs as costs of extended operations. *Women's Energy Matters Reply Brief, October 22, 2025, pp. 2-4.* D2512007 summarizes WEM's original analysis, and acknowledges that WEM and other parties have raised "legitimate concerns" that PG&E may be recovering overspending on DCPP transition and renewal costs in excess of the	PG&E has tracked to the DCEOBA to *see* if they instead should be recorded in the DCTRMA. WEM also argues that PG&E is straying from the date-based method for distinguishing between transition and operational costs approved in D.24-12-033 by stating in A.25-03-015 testimony by PG&E witness Brian Ketelsen that '[p]roject cost forecast to be incurred earlier than November 3, 2024, not funded by reserves from the 2023 GRC, and forecast to be complete and in service earlier than December 31, 2026, are generally tracked to the Diablo Canyon Transition Memorandum Account and funded through the DWR Loan.' WEM points out that D.24-12-033 had defined extended operations costs as 'project scoping, design, engineering, procurement and implementation efforts [that] generally begin after the original Unit 1 license expiration date of November 2, 2024.' WEM then states about the use of the verb 'incurred' in Mr. Ketelsen's testimony: 'This is entirely new. Ketelsen has morphed the Commission's [D.24-12-033] language into a new framework that would allow PG&E to illegally shift transition cost onto ratepayers in this proceeding.'" *D2512007, pp. 20-21 (footnotes omitted).* *From D2512007:* "TURN, WEM, SBUA, and A4NR raise legitimate concerns that PG&E may be recovering, in this	

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
$1.4 billion DWR loan. *See* exact citations in opposite column.	application, overspending on DCPP transition and renewal costs in excess of the $1.4 billion DWR loan, as referenced in the TLRES." In oral arguments, Mr. Ketelsen stated that PG&E was "in the process of a reprioritization to ensure we utilized the full [DWR] amount without going over." While the DWR and CPUC are required to conduct a semiannual true-up to review PG&E's use of DWR loan proceeds, which includes Advice Letter submittals by PG&E summarizing DWR spending; 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 DCPP extended operations." *D2512007, p. 25.*	
*3. WEM's Comments on the Proposed Decision contributed to revisions to Section 6.1.2, COL 6(sic), and Ordering Paragraph 6 (sic). (Note: D2512007 contains typos and the referenced revisions actually are Section 6.1.2, COL **5**, and Ordering Paragraph **5**.)* WEM provided a detailed procedural summary of the transition costs / extended operations issue, including references to D2212005 (in A1608006) wherein the Commission had noted, "PG&E states that the costs of these transition and relicensing activities will not be recovered from ratepayers. Instead, costs recorded	D2512007 cites WEM's Comments on Proposed Decision at pp. 1-8 as a reason for making changes to the Final Decision: "We have carefully reviewed all comments and reply comments and made appropriate changes as warranted. Below, we describe some of these changes. In response to comments on the proposed decision filed by A4NR, SBUA, TURN, and WEM, we have added requirements in Section 6.1.2, Conclusion of Law 6, and Ordering Paragraph 6 that PG&E disclose whenever any DCPP costs previously proposed as transition and license renewal costs are subsequently recategorized and	Verified

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
in the DCTRMA are to be funded solely through government funding streams…" *[See WEM Comments on Proposed Decision, p. 2]*. WEM reviewed its own work on the cost shift issue in the earlier proceeding, and noted the Commission's statement in D2212005 that future extended operations proceedings would examine whether additional ratepayer protections are needed in the event there are any shortfalls in government funding." *See WEM Comments on Proposed Decision, d. November 20, 2025, pp. 1-8, with quoted material at pp. 2 and 3*. Consistent with WEM's advocacy, the Final Decision contains added language intended to protect ratepayers from future cost shifts. *See* exact citations in opposite column.	proposed for recovery in a future DCPP forecast proceeding, 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 as a cost for DCPP." *D2512007, pp.77-78.* [Please note that the Decision contains a typographical error in referencing COL 6 and Ordering Paragraph 6. The correct references are COL 5 and Ordering Paragraph 5, which relate to the new requirement that PGE 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 DCPP forecast proceedings for DCPP 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 operations.] From Section 6.1.2: "While the DWR and CPUC are required to conduct a semiannual true-up to review PG&E's use of DWR loan proceeds, which includes Advice Letter submittals by PG&E summarizing DWR spending; 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 DCPP extended operations. In future DCPP cost recovery applications, it	

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
	is reasonable to require PG&E 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 DCPP forecast proceedings for DCPP 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 operations. *D2512007, pp. 25-26.* COL ~~6~~ (sic) 5: "5. PG&E should be required to disclose in future DCPP cost recovery applications whenever any transition and license renewal costs that were part of the amounts included in the TLRES are proposed for recovery in any future DCPP forecast proceedings, 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 in extended operations." *D2512007, p. 82.* Ordering Paragraph ~~6~~ (sic) 5: 5. Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) must disclose whenever any transition and license renewal costs that were part of the amounts detailed in the Transition and License Renewal Expenditure Summary in PG&E witness Brian Ketelsen's sworn federal court affidavit are proposed for recovery in any future Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) forecast proceedings for DCPP extended operations,	

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
	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 operations. *D2512007, p. 84.*	
4. By its active participation, WEM enriched the record of the proceeding WEM made substantial contributions to D2512007, even though not all of its positions were adopted in total.	Enriching the record is a substantial contribution: *see D0506027 at p. 5*, which finds that if a customer provides a unique perspective that enriches the Commission's deliberations and the record, the Commission can find that the customer made a substantial contribution. A substantial contribution includes evidence or argument that supports part of the decision, even if the CPUC does not adopt a party's position in total. *D0203033, p.3.*	The Commission acknowledges WEM's active participation and contribution in this proceeding.

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: California Alliance for Renewable Energy (CaRE) and Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility (A4NR) held similar positions on the cost shift issue, but WEM presented a unique analysis. WEM held similar positions to other parties on other issues as well (e.g., TURN's position on escalation fees and its critique of PG&E's volumetric performance fees spending plan). WEM chose not to spend time on these issues because they were being ably litigated by other parties.		Noted
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: WEM's work on the transitions costs /cost shift issue was unique, and was rooted in WEM's earlier work in proceeding A1608006, where WEM made		Noted

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
substantial contributions to D2212005, regarding the establishment of the DCTRMA and DCEOBA accounts. PG&E's administration of these two accounts is at the heart of the cost shift issue in this proceeding. WEM thoroughly reviewed record evidence on the issue and provided unique analysis that is summarized at pp 20-21 of D2512007. To the extent duplication may have occurred, it was unavoidable: given the importance of this issue it is not a surprise that so many parties spoke up, each offering its own unique perspective and contribution. WEM made every effort to work efficiently and cooperatively with other parties and kept our efforts in alignment with our own expertise.		

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§§ 1801 and 1806):

	CPUC Discussion
a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness: As detailed in Section IIA above, WEM's litigation positions are reflected in D2512007, and the Commission credits WEM's Comments on the Proposed Decision as contributing to a change made to the Final Decision. That change institutes disclosure requirements that PG&E must follow in future proceedings and is intended to protect ratepayers from further attempts by PG&E to pass tens of millions of dollars in transition costs onto California ratepayers. WEM's work in this proceeding was in line with its expertise. WEM has been a party to the Commission's past proceedings regarding Diablo Canyon extended operations and its Executive Director, Jean Merrigan, is well versed on the issues. This translates to efficient use of time, spending minimum hours to address complex issues. Merrigan's rate is low, considering her years of experience as a ratepayer advocate specializing in issues related to California's nuclear power plants. The cost to ratepayers of WEM's participation in this proceeding is far below the dollar value benefit to ratepayers, who benefited from WEM's independent analysis.	Noted
b. Reasonableness of hours claimed: WEM's claim is significantly lower than the total forecast in its NOI. Jean Merrigan maintained detailed time records, indicating the number of hours spent on distinct tasks and issues. She reviewed all of the recorded hours, and included only those that were necessary. This included eliminating any time spent on clerical tasks, or entries unrelated to issues in the rulemaking. WEM has under-represented its time, including time spent evaluating PG&E's and other parties' Testimony on the VPF spending plan issue and the fee escalation methodology issue, time spent virtually attending the Voting Meeting, and time	Noted

	CPUC Discussion
spent preparing this compensation request. All of the hours included in this claim should be compensated in full.	
c. Allocation of hours by issue: COSTS: Work related to challenging PG&E's assertions that all project expenses in its 2026 forecast qualify as expenses to be recorded in the DCEOBA. GEN: Work necessary for active participation in the proceeding such as reviewing ALJ and Commissioner Rulings, responding to ALJ requests, coordinating with other parties, attending the Pre-Hearing Conference, and necessary preparation or review of materials that cannot be categorized under COSTS. HRGS: Preparing for and attending evidentiary hearings. Please note that the September 9, 2025 evidentiary hearing dealt mostly with the cost shift issue and therefore most of WEM's September 9 hearing time is categorized under COSTS. COMP: Time spent preparing the NOI and this Claim for Intervenor Compensation. Percentages: COSTS (80%), GEN (6.3%), HRGS (1.4%) COMP (11.3%).	Noted, totals 99%.

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	**Year**	Hours	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Total $**
Jean Merrigan	2025	127.30	$255.00	D2411023, plus 2025 COLA, plus 5% step increase for 2025 [*see* comment]	$32,461.50	115.00 [2]	$255.00 [1]	$29,325.00
				Subtotal: $32,461.50				***Subtotal: $29,325.00***
**INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION ** **								
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Total $**
Jean Merrigan	20	4.30	$127.50	½ 2025 rate	$548.25	4.30	$127.50 [1]	$548.25

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
	25							
Jean Merrigan	2026	12.00	$135.00	½ of 2026 rate of $270 (2025 rate plus a 5% step increase for 2026). WEM requests the 2026 COLA also be added once issued – *see* comment.	$1,620.00	5.00 [3]	$137.50 [1]	$687.50
					Subtotal: $2,168.25			***Subtotal: $1,235.75***
					TOTAL REQUEST: $34,629.75			***TOTAL AWARD: $30,560.75***

*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. 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[2]:

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	WEM Time Records
3	Jean Merrigan Resume
Comment	Jean Merrigan's 2025 rate is based on her 2024 rate of $235, plus one 5% step increase for her role as a Level III Advocate/Executive Director, plus 2025 COLA. Merrigan is a hybrid Advocate/Executive Director and Expert/Public Policy Analyst with 9 years' experience as an Executive Director, and more than 12 years' experience as a public policy analyst and expert witness. *See* Hourly Rate Chart (effective January 1, 2021), with escalation percentages, ALJ-393 at p. 5 (re: eligibility for step increases), and prior CPUC ruling on Merrigan's rate in D2411023 at p. 25.

[2] Attachments not included in the final Decision.

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Comment	Jean Merrigan's 2026 rate is based on her 2025 rate of $255, plus a second 5% step increase for her role as a Level III Advocate/Executive Director. WEM requests that the 2026 COLA be added to Merrigan's rate once determined by the CPUC.

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
[1] Jean Merrigan 2025 and 2026 Hourly Rates and Intervenor Compensation Rate	WEM requests an hourly rate of $255.00 for Merrigan in 2025. WEM is also requesting a 5% step increase to be added in the calculation of Merrigan's 2024 hourly rate, which would be the first step increase for Merrigan in the role of Advocate - Executive Director – III. D.24-11-023 previously approved the 2024 rate of $235 for Merrigan. We apply the 5% step increase to this previously approved rate with the addition of the 2025 COLA of 3.46%, and approve a 2025 hourly rate of $255, rounded to the nearest five dollars, for Merrigan here and moving forward for all work performed in 2025. We apply half of Merrigan's 2025 rate of $255.00 for an intervenor compensation claim preparation rate of $127.50. WEM requests an hourly rate of $270.00 for Merrigan in 2026. WEM requests we apply an escalation factor and step increase for Merrigan's 2026 hourly rate. Per ALJ-393, we apply the 2026 escalation factor of 3.35% and second, and final, 5% step increase to Merrigan's 2025 rate for the Advocate - Executive Director – III classification, resulting in a 2026 hourly rate of $275.00. We apply half of Merrigan's 2026 rate of $275.00 for an intervenor compensation claim preparation rate of $137.50.
[2] Lack of Substantial Contribution to the Decision-Making Process	<u>Hours related to Research:</u> WEM claims time for research concerning appellate and state court litigation, the Commission's authority and duty to cease extended operations, and a Joint Agency reliability report. However, the Scoping Memo expressly excluded from this proceeding whether PG&E's extended operation of DCPP was cost-effective and reiterated that long-term system reliability needs were outside the scope of the proceeding. The claimed time entries do not sufficiently demonstrate how this research advanced an issue within the scope of A.25-03-015 or contributed to the Commission's decision-making process. Accordingly, 3.30 hours requested for these activities are reduced. • 05/25/2025: "Research re: appeals court litigation as it relates to this proceeding", 0.60 hours • 08/03/2025: "Research PUC 712.8(c)(1) issues including status state court proceedings", 0.70 hours

Item	Reason
	• 09/03/2025: "Thorough review of law re: CPUC's authority and duty to cease extended ops (incl. review and analysis 712.8 ratemaking provisions)", 1.80 hours • 09/03/2025: "Brief review Joint Agency 2025 SB846 Reliability Report for bearing on this proceeding", 0.20 hours WEM claims 7.10 hours for legal research and continued review of the law and record concerning the cost-transition issue. While the issue was relevant to the proceeding, WEM does not identify the specific legal or factual issues researched, or the resulting work produced, or how such work advanced the record or impacted the decision making. The descriptions therefore do not establish a distinct contribution of the claimed time, particularly given the overlapping positions advanced by other parties. Accordingly, we reduce 7.10 hours. • 09/09/2025: "Review record and law (D2312036, SB 846) on transition costs after cross-exams of Ketelsen at today's hearing", 1.50 hours • 09/12/2025: "Legal research (PUC §712.8, D2412033, Res E-5299, PGE AL 7204-E, 6870-E, 6870-E-A.", 3.20 hours • 09/14/2025: "Continued review and analysis law and record on cost transition issue after hearings", 2.40 hours <u>Vagueness (2025: 1.90 hours):</u> Hours for the following activities are reduced because they are vague and lack the necessary detail to demonstrate how they contributed to the decision-making process: • 10/16/2025: "Review fall update", 0.50 hours • 10/17/2025: "Research re CAISO original forecast and fall update numbers as comparison 2024, 2025, 2026", 0.40 hours • 10/20/2025: "Review fall update CAISO numbers and compare vs. original", 0.70 hours • 12/04/2025: "Listen to Commissioner discussion of PD at Voting Meeting", 0.30 hours
[3] Excessive Intervenor Compensation Preparation Hours	WEM's submitted timesheets showing Merrigan worked 4.30 hours in 2025 and 12.00 hours in 2026 to prepare this intervenor compensation request. While the claim was organized and generally compliant with Commission requirements, we find the preparation hours excessive given the scope of issues, the overall scale of the request, and the fact that a single representative, who is also the individual preparing the claim, was involved. WEM and Merrigan have significant experience practicing before the Commission and preparing similar claims, and we would expect greater efficiency in compiling this request. Additionally, WEM did not provide a

Item	Reason
	rationale explaining why this particular claim—smaller in scale than some of their previous submissions—required this level of effort. Accordingly, we reduce Merrigan's claimed 2026 hours by 7.00 hours, awarding 5.00 hours for preparing this claim. This adjustment better reflects the complexity and scale of the request.

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. Women's Energy Matters' has made a substantial contribution in some aspects to D2512007.

2. The requested hourly rates for Women's Energy Matters' 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 $30,560.75.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. Women's Energy Matters is awarded $30,560.75.

2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall pay Women's Energy Matters' 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 21, 2026, the 75th day after the filing of Women's Energy Matter'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
Commissioners

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:	D2610075	**Modifies Decision?**	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2512007		
Proceeding(s):	A2503015		
Author:	ALJ Jack Chang		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Women's Energy Matters	2/5/2026	$34,629.75	$30,560.75	N/A	*See* Part III.D CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments above.

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Jean	Merrigan	Advocate/Exec. Dir.	$255.00	2025	$255.00
Jean	Merrigan	Advocate/Exec. Dir.	$270.00	2026	$275.00

(END OF APPENDIX)