

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ SEYBERT** (Mailed 12/8/2023)**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Approval of the Retirement of Diablo Canyon Power Plant, Implementation of the Joint Proposal, And Recovery of Associated Costs Through Proposed Ratemaking Mechanisms. (U39E.)

Application 16-08-006

**DECISION DENYING COMPENSATION TO CALIFORNIANS
FOR GREEN NUCLEAR POWER, INC. FOR SUBSTANTIAL
CONTRIBUTIONS TO DECISION 22-12-005**

Intervenor: Californians for Green Nuclear Power, Inc.	For contribution to Decision (D.) 22-12-005
Claimed: \$36,434.75 + \$116,647.34	Awarded: \$0 (100% reduction)
Assigned Commissioner: Alice Reynolds	Assigned ALJ: Ehren Seybert

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.22-12-005 implements Sections 712.8(c)(1)(A) and 712.8(e) of the Public Utilities Code requiring the Commission to direct and authorize Pacific Gas and Electric Company to take “all actions that would be necessary” so as to preserve the option of extended operations at Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant beyond the current expiration dates, and to track all costs associated with continued and extended operations. • Ordering Paragraphs (OPs) 1 and 14 of D.18-01-022 were invalidated.
--	---

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:	October 6, 2016	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI filed:	February 28, 2017	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:	A.16-08-006	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	April 5, 2017	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
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:	A.16-08-006	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	April 5, 2017	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	Yes
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.22-12-005	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	12/6/2022	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	01/27/2023	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

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

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
1.	CGNP's Reply Comments in A.16-08-006 were filed on October 14, 2022 as noted on page 5 of the Commission's Decision.	Noted.
2.	Per the A.16-08-006 Scoping Ruling issued on September 23, 2022 at pp. 5-6, " Parties that have already been found eligible in A.16-08-006 do not need to file notices of intent. [3] A party already found eligible, however, must file an amended notice of intent within 15 days after the issuance of this Amended Scoping Memo if there have been material changes to their customer status and/or showing of significant financial hardship. [4]" <i>CGNP affirms there have been no material changes to their customer status and/or showing of significant financial hardship.</i>	Noted.

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. Californians for Green Nuclear Power (CGNP) directly contributed to ordering paragraphs 1. and 2.</p> <p>CGNP is distinguished by being the only Party to make such fundamental contributions to D.22-12-005.</p>	<p>The entirety of CGNP's voluminous written and oral testimony in all phases of A.16-08-006 directly contributed to the enactment of Senate Bill (SB) 846 (Dodd) on September 2, 2022, leading to the Commission's pair of ordering paragraphs below. In the instant phase, further clarifications were provided by Reply Comments of Californians for Green Nuclear Power, Inc. (dated October 14, 2022) to PG&E's Opening Comments dated October 7, 2022.</p> <p>1. Ordering Paragraphs 1. and 14. of Commission Decision 18-01-022 are null and void. (Emphasis added.</p>	<p>CGNP's only engagement during this phase of the proceeding was to submit Reply Comments to PG&E's Opening Comments on the Amended Scoping Memo.</p> <p>CGNP's Reply Comments do not respond to any of the issues raised in PG&E's Opening Comments, and they also do not address the new issue added to the proceeding</p>

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
	<p>Ordering paragraphs 1. and 14. are shown below in italics.) <i>(Ordering Paragraph 1. Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s proposal to retire Diablo Canyon Unit 1 in 2024 and Unit 2 in 2025 is approved.</i></p> <p><i>Ordering Paragraph 14. Application 16-08-006 is closed)</i></p> <p>2. Pacific Gas and Electric Company is authorized and directed to take all of the actions identified in this decision, and any other actions that would be any other actions that would be necessary, to operate Diablo Canyon power plant Units 1 and 2 beyond the current federal license expiration dates, so as to preserve the option of extended operations until the following retirement dates, conditional upon continued authorization to operate by the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission: (i) for Unit 1, October 31, 2029; (ii) for Unit 2, October 31, 2030.</p>	<p>scope by the Amended Scoping Memo. Consequentially, D.22-12-005 does not use any of the information from CGNP’s Reply Comments in its deliberations, as evidenced by the fact that the decision did not cite to CGNP’s arguments at all.</p> <p>For CGNP to claim it contributed to the decision, it is not sufficient to simply note that CGNP supported the position the Decision ultimately adopted; they must also demonstrate the CPUC relied on CGNP’s analysis in its decision-making. This claim does not meet those requirements.</p> <p>For the reasons discussed above, we conclude that CGNP did not substantially contribute to this phase of the proceeding.</p>

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
2. CGNP indirectly contributed to ordering paragraphs 3. through 8.	Ordering paragraphs 1. and 2. are necessary conditions for each of the ordering paragraphs 3. through 8.	<i>See above.</i>

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?	No party held views similar to our primary position to relicense Diablo Canyon and to continue operation beyond 2024-2025. Some parties held somewhat similar positions on other issues, but for different reasons.	Noted.
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Several parties, including ORA, CLECA, and Shell, expressed positions similar to CGNP regarding deferral of replacement power decisions to an IRP. ORA expressed positions similar to CGNP regarding Employee Retention and CIMP.		Verified. Note that “ORA” here should refer instead to “Cal Advocates.”
d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication: Despite other parties’ objections to some of PG&E’s positions regarding Replacement Power, Employee Retention, and CIMP, CGNP claims that its participation in and contribution to this proceeding did not duplicate that of any other party. CGNP’s reasons for opposing PG&E’s positions were unique. Given that the Commission quoted from CGNP’s filings in reaching important findings, the Commission should conclude that no reduction in compensation are warranted due to any duplication of effort.		Noted.

C. Additional Comments on Part II:

#	Intervenor's Comment	CPUC Discussion
1.	<p>It should be noted that in the other phases of this proceeding, the Commission reduced CGNP's previous award by \$116,647.34.</p> <p>A key rationale for the reduction was ordering paragraph 1 in D.18-01-022, which ordered PG&E to retire Diablo by 2025.</p> <p>D.22-12-05 has now overturned that ordering paragraph.</p> <p>Since intervenor compensation awards are set on the basis of how a Party's actions support the Commission's Decision, it is just and reasonable to (<i>at a minimum</i>) allow CGNP to recover a significant portion of the \$116,647.34 that was denied.</p>	<p>This request is procedurally erroneous. As stated in the November 23, 2023 Amended Scoping Memo and Ruling of the Assigned Commissioner and Assigned Administrative Law Judge (Amended Scoping Memo), A.16-08-006 was reopened to add one limited issue concerning the establishment of new extended operations cost tracking accounts, consistent with Public Utilities Code Sections 712.8(c)(1)(A) and 712.8(e), and parties were directed to limit their comments to address this one additional scoping issue. (Amended Scoping Memo at 1and 31-4). A.16-08-006 was not reopened to relitigate previous Commission decisions.</p>

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

	CPUC Discussion
<p>a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness: Preface: Californians for Green Nuclear Power (CGNP) was the sole party in these extended proceedings who advocated for the eventual outcome, i.e., the preservation of extended operations at Diablo Canyon Power Plant.</p> <p>Arguably, CGNP not only substantially contributed to the final decision, but actually proposed it, several years ago.</p> <p>It is challenging to state the following without it appearing to be gloating, and that is certainly not CGNP's intention. However, in repeated filings throughout these proceedings, it must be noted that CGNP repeatedly stated (and submitted substantive</p>	<p>These comments are inaccurate and misleading.</p> <p>First, D.22-12-005 does not "[recognize] the validity" the statements listed by CGNP; in fact,</p>

	CPUC Discussion
<p>evidence and testimony to back its statements):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That Diablo Canyon currently supplies approximately 17 percent of California’s zero-carbon electricity supply and 8.6 percent of California’s total electricity supply. • That preserving the option of continued operations of the Diablo Canyon powerplant for an additional five years beyond 2025 would likely be necessary to improve statewide energy system reliability and to reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases while additional renewable energy and zero-carbon resources come online. And: • That preserving Diablo Canyon would be prudent, cost effective, and in the best interests of all California electricity customers. <p>In D.22-12-005, the Commission recognized the validity of all of the above statements, and each formed the basis of the decision. Thus, CGNP contributed in the most substantial way possible to the final decision.</p> <p>For completeness, the following appeared in Decision 18-10-014, dated October 11, 2018.</p> <p>CGNP’s extensive contributions covered the full scope issues considered in the proceeding. CGNP scientists brought to attention a range of issues that would not otherwise have been part of the record. These were backed by extensive research of the literature and of previous regulatory filings. As outlined above CGNP’s participation influenced the proceeding and decision in several respects, so that the hours claimed are reasonable.</p> <p>The final decision disallowed a number of costs to the ratepayer as had been advocated by CGNP. This included the rejection of Tranche 1 energy efficiency procurements, with a \$1.3 billion reduction in revenue requirement. CGNP arguments helped to bring about PG&E’s unilateral announcement that it would withdraw Tranches 2 and 3, as well as the Clean Energy Charge, with substantial savings to the ratepayer. The Community Impacts Mitigation Program was disallowed, eliminating an \$85 million revenue requirement, consistent with CGNP arguments. The proposed Employee Retention Program was also greatly reduced in scope and cost, based upon reasoning in the decision that cited CGNP arguments.</p>	<p>it does not reference those statements at all. D.22-12-005’s only mention of CGNP’s comments is to acknowledge their existence; the decision does not use CGNP’s comments in its deliberations.</p> <p>Second, the text that CGNP notes “appears” in D.18-10-014 is from the “General Claim of Reasonableness,” i.e., that text was written by CGNP itself as justification for its compensation request.</p> <p>These comments do not support a claim of reasonableness.</p>

	CPUC Discussion
<p>These substantial reductions in costs to the ratepayer exceed by orders of magnitude the cost of CGNP efforts in this proceeding. Thus CGNP’s claim should be found to be reasonable.</p>	
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed: CGNP was vigorously involved in every aspect of the proceeding. CGNP was assiduous in ensuring that its participation in all stages of this proceeding was efficient, professional and cost-effective. Both the hourly rates and overall costs claimed are reasonable, and generally consistent with awards to other parties having comparable experience. CGNP divided the efforts efficiently according to the expertise of its experts.</p> <p>Mike Gatto is CGNP’s lead attorney. He is a former four-term member of the California State Assembly. During his tenure he presided over Assembly sessions as Assistant Speaker, and chaired the Appropriations, Consumer Protections and Privacy, and Utilities and Commerce Committees. He has substantial experience in cases before the California Public Utilities Commission.</p> <p>Dr. Abe Weitzberg is CGNP’s expert on nuclear power technology and operations. He researched the ability of Diablo Canyon to be run in a flexible mode. He researched the issues and costs related to the employee retention program and the Community Impacts Mitigation Program. Dr. Weitzberg has fifty-seven years of broad-based experience within the nuclear industry, including commercial nuclear power and the support of U. S. Government programs.</p> <p>Dr. Michael Marinak is CGNP’s expert on nuclear energy costs. His nuclear engineering degree and research affords him knowledge across the broad range of issues related to nuclear energy technology, including economics. He performed analysis of the costs of continued operations of Diablo Canyon, including extensive analysis of PG&E’s current and previous regulatory filings as well as industry data. He analyzed the direct and imposed costs of intermittent solar and wind sources proposed as replacements. Dr. Marinak also performed an in-depth review estimates for future DCCP expenses put forth by TURN, CEERT and FOE. In 2005, Dr. Marinak provided input to the CPUC A.04.01-009 proceeding regarding DCCP's Replacement Steam Generators. He has 26 years experience as a computational physicist in nuclear energy research.</p> <p>Dr. Gene Nelson is CGNP’s Government Liaison and Legal Assistant. He was responsible for drafting and filing almost all CGNP submissions in this proceeding - mostly under the guidance of Attorney Mike Gatto, exceeding</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	CPUC Discussion
<p>1,300 pages. He performed detailed analysis of the cost of replacing Diablo Canyon with photovoltaics and pumped storage systems. He performed extensive research and analysis of PG&E’s previous relevant regulatory filings. He represented CGNP at most meetings associated with this application. His education includes a Ph.D. in Radiation Biophysics. He recently served as an engineering professor at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo and a physical sciences professor at Cuesta College, among other colleges and universities.</p> <p>Dr. Nelson has been involved in community and regulatory matters regarding the safe operation of Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) since he and his wife relocated to San Luis Obispo, California in 2006. In support of DCPP since 2006, he has been volunteering as an Amateur Radio operator in connection with DCPP, the American Red Cross and the San Luis Obispo Emergency Communications Council. He began participating in Diablo Canyon Independent Safety Committee (DCISC) meetings in 2007. He began collaborating with CGNP in 2013. His community outreach includes numerous letters to the editor, "OpEds" and participation in radio and television interviews regarding DCPP. He has also been active in pro-DCPP outreach to relevant governmental and regulatory bodies. He strongly advocates for the continued safe operation of DCPP beyond 2025.</p> <p>Dr. Alex Cannara is CGNP’s expert in electrical engineering and electric power grids. His extensive analysis described the limitations of solar and wind systems proposed as replacements for Diablo Canyon. He analyzed overall environmental impacts of these sources proposed as replacements in Tranches 2 and 3. He analyzed the ability of increased energy efficiency to meet the goals proposed in Tranche 1. He also researched patterns of demand in the CAISO grid, including quantifying the need for baseload generation. He has extensive experience presenting talks on the safety, environment benefits and economic benefits of nuclear energy to corporate, professional and environmental audiences.</p> <p>The Commission should find that the involvement of each of the aforementioned experts was necessary for CGNP to address completely the range of issues in the proceeding. The Commission should approve CGNP’s claim in its entirety.</p>	
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue: 100% of CGNP's hours in all phases of A.16-08-006 were dedicated to preserving the option of extended operations of Diablo Canyon Power Plant beyond its previously scheduled closure date in 2025.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	CPUC Discussion

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Michael Gatto	2022-2023	18.4	\$715.00	Combination of training, experience, and achievements to date. See attached summary.	\$13,156.00	0 [1]	\$0	\$0.00
Gene Nelson, Ph.D.	2022-2023	88.7	\$220.00	Combination of training, experience, and achievements to date. See attached summary.	\$19,514.00	0 [2]	\$0	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$32,670.00						Subtotal: \$0		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Michael Gatto	2023	2.5	\$357.50	Half above requested Attorney fees	\$893.75	0 [1]	\$0	\$0.00
Gene Nelson, Ph.D.	2023	26.1	\$110.00	Half above requested Expert fees	\$2,871.00	0 [2]	\$0	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$3,764.75						Subtotal: \$0		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$36,434.75						TOTAL AWARD: \$0		

*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 1/2 of preparer's normal hourly rate

CLAIMED			CPUC AWARD
ATTORNEY INFORMATION			
Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR ²	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation
Michael Anthony Gatto	12/01/2004	232675	No

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
[A] Michael Gatto Total Hours	Certificate of Service
2	Appendix with time and expense records and statements of qualifications.

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
[1] Michael Gatto Total Hours	<p>As noted in Part II and Part III, Section A of this document, we conclude that CGNP did not substantially contribute to D.22-12-005. Accordingly, any claim for compensation is inherently unreasonable. We therefore reduce Michael Gatto's hours to zero.</p> <p>In this phase of the proceeding, parties had three opportunities to comment: first, they could issue Reply Comments in response to PG&E's Opening Comments on the Amended Scoping Memo; second, they could submit opening and reply comments on the Proposed Decision. CGNP elected only to submit Reply Comments in Response to PG&E's Opening Comments.</p> <p>The Amended Scoping Memo clearly laid out which issues the Reply Comments could address, and all of those issues related to: (1) the establishment of new accounts to track the costs associated with the continued and extended operations of Diablo Canyon Units 1 and 2; and (2) whether a process should be established to refine or enhance any new cost tracking accounts.</p> <p>CGNP's Reply Comments ignored these issues and instead argued that: (1) "High Energy Cost (And Cost Of Capital) Hurts Wind And Solar;" (2) the</p>

² This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

Item	Reason
	“Inflated Post-2025 DCPD Cost Projections In The 2016 CEERT – TURN – FoE Study;” and that (3) “DCPD’s Electricity Cost Will Likely Decrease After 2025 For Two Reasons.” These three topics are not responsive to the directions of the Amended Scoping Memo. Accordingly, CGNP’s comments did not make a substantial contribution to D.22-12-005.
[2] Gene Nelson Total Hours	As noted in Part II and Part III, Section A of this document, we conclude that CGNP did not substantially contribute to D.22-12-005. Accordingly, any claim for compensation is inherently unreasonable. We therefore reduce Gene Nelson’s hours to zero.

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
---	----

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion
<u>Party</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>CPUC Discussion</u>
<u>CGNP</u>	<u>The extension of DCPD operations was a central issue in A.16-08-006 and D.22-12-005, and CGNP was the only party in all three phases of the proceeding to advocate for extending DCPD operations.</u>	<u>While CGNP is correct that the issue of DCPD operations was scoped into A.16-08-006, intervenor compensation awards are based on contributions to a Commission order or decision. (See Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801.3, 1802(j), 1803(a), 1803.1(a) and D.98-04-059).</u> <u>There were several Commission decisions adopted in A.16-08-006. In the Amended Scoping Memo leading to D.22-12-005, parties</u>

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion
		<p>were directed to limit their comments to address the establishment of new DCPD extended operations <i>cost tracking accounts</i>. The Amended Scoping Memo also indicates that additional issues concerning the implementation of SB 846 – including whether DCPD extended operations should be extended – may be considered in a subsequent phase of A.16-08-006 or through a new rulemaking. Consistent with that direction, D.22-12-005 did not address the establishment of new retirement dates for DCPD, and affirms the Commission’s intent to open a new rulemaking to continue to implement SB 846. (See D.22-12-005 at 6 and 24).</p> <p>While D.22-12-005 also invalidates Ordering Paragraphs 1 and 14 of D.18-01-022, concerning the Commission’s prior approval of the retirement of DCPD, this invalidation was already enacted by the Legislature through the passage of SB 846.³ The corresponding invalidation of the Commission’s prior order in D.22-12-005 was to ensure consistency with the statute, and was not based on the merits or costs of actual DCPD extended operations, as argued in CGNP’s October 14, 2022 comments.</p>

³ [Pub. Util. Code § 712.8\(b\)\(1\) states “Ordering paragraphs \(1\) and \(14\) of commission Decision 18-01-022 \(January 11, 2018\) Decision Approving Retirement of Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, are hereby invalidated.”](#)

Party	Comment		CPUC Discussion
CGNP	<p>The plain language of Pub. Util. Code §§1801 and 1802(j) show that CGNP has made a "substantial contribution" to D.22-12-005. Also, without CGNP's advocacy throughout A.16-08-006, as well as CGNP's help in crafting and enacting SB 846, Conclusions of Law 3 through 31 in D.22-12-005 would have been null and void.</p>		<p>See discussion above.</p> <p>Previous intervenor compensation awards to CGNP in A.16-08-006 were appropriately based on CGNP's contributions to those individual decisions, at the time the evidentiary record was submitted for a decision.</p> <p>While CGNP may have helped to craft and enact SB 846, the Commission does not award intervenor compensation for time spent on public advocacy campaigns.</p>

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Californians for Green Nuclear Power, Inc. has not made a substantial contribution to D.22-12-005.
2. The total reasonable compensation is \$0.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Claim does not satisfy all the requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. Californians for Green Nuclear Power, Inc. is awarded \$0.
2. The comment period for today's decision is not waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1810014, D1906014		
Proceeding(s):	A1608006		
Author:	Ehren Seybert		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Californians for Green Nuclear Power, Inc.	01/27/2023	\$36,434.75 + \$116,647.34	\$0	N/A	See CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments section.

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Michael	Gatto	Attorney	\$715	2022	\$0
Michael	Gatto	Attorney	\$715	2023	\$0
Gene	Nelson	Expert	\$220	2022	\$0
Gene	Nelson	Expert	\$220	2023	\$0

(END OF APPENDIX)

Summary report:	
Litera Compare for Word 11.0.0.61 Document comparison done on 1/9/2024 10:30:42 AM	
Style name: Default Style	
Intelligent Table Comparison: Active	
Original filename: Agenda ID# 22153 - A1608006 PD ICOMP (CGNP D2212005) (revision template).docx	
Modified filename: A1608006 PD ICOMP (CGNP D2212005) REV 1 (clean version).docx	
Changes:	
Add	10
Delete	20
Move From	0
<u>Move To</u>	0
<u>Table Insert</u>	1
Table Delete	1
<u>Table moves to</u>	0
Table moves from	0
Embedded Graphics (Visio, ChemDraw, Images etc.)	0
Embedded Excel	0
Format changes	0
Total Changes:	32