

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJs ROSCOW and YIP-KIKUGAWA**  
(Mailed 4/2/2015)

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company  
(U902E) For Authority To Update Marginal Costs,  
Cost Allocation, And Electric Rate Design.

Application 11-10-002  
(Filed October 3, 2011)

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO THE VOTE SOLAR INITIATIVE FOR  
CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 14-01-002**

<b>Claimant: The Vote Solar Initiative</b>	<b>For contribution to Decision (D.) 14-01-002</b>
<b>Claimed: \$ 31,239.75</b>	<b>Awarded: \$10,790.25 (~ 65.46% reduction)</b>
<b>Assigned Commissioner: Michael Picker</b>	<b>Assigned ALJs: Stephen C. Roscow Amy C. Yip-Kikugawa</b>

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

<b>A. Brief Description of Decision:</b>	D.14-01-002 addresses the application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) to establish marginal costs, allocate revenues, and design rates for service, approves a settlement for revenue allocation and rate design, and rejects a settlement addressing Medium and Large Commercial and Industrial Distribution Demand Charges.
--	---

**B. Claimant must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util.  
Code §§ 1801-1812:**

	<b>Claimant</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	December 9, 2011	Yes.
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI Filed:	January 9, 2012	Yes.
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes.

Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.10-05-006	Yes.
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	March 3, 2011	Yes.
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the Claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes.
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.10-05-006	Yes.
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	March 3, 2011	Yes.
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes.
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.14-01-002	Yes.
14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:	January 23, 2014	Yes.
15. File date of compensation request:	March 21, 2014	Yes.
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes.

**PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION****A. Description of Claimant’s contribution to the final decision (see § 1802(i), § 1803(a) & D.98-04-059).**

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution	Specific References to Claimant’s Presentations and to Decision	Showing Accepted by CPUC
<p>Vote Solar’s substantial contribution to the Commission’s final decision approving SDG&amp;E’s general rate case application relates to the fact that SDG&amp;E was forced to refile its application to remove the Network Use Charge (NUC). Vote Solar’s participation early in this proceeding helped lead to efficient disposition of a contested issue, without the significant anticipated expense of litigating the issue of whether the NUC proposal was cost-justified. This significant early success allowed Vote Solar to minimize the overall expense of its participation in this proceeding.</p>	<p>D.14-01-002 at p. 3 recites the procedural history of A.11-10-002, which references the significance of Commissioner Ferron’s January 18, 2012 Scoping Memo and Ruling (Ruling) and recognizes that Vote Solar filed a protest to SDG&amp;E’s application and a response to UCAN’s October 27, 2011 motion (UCAN Motion) challenging the legality of the NUC proposal.</p> <p>Vote Solar provided consistent opposition to the NUC proposal on the basis that it was illegal. This opposition is seen through Vote Solar’s Protest, Response to UCAN’s Motion and on-the-record statements at the prehearing conference held on December 9, 2011.</p> <p>Commissioner Ferron’s Ruling noted that the decision to find the NUC proposal as out of scope of the proceeding was “based on the responses to UCAN’s motion and comments at the PHC...”. Ruling at p. 7.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Assigned Commissioner Ferron's January 18, 2012 Scoping Memo, at page 7, ruled that NUC was outside the scope of the proceeding. "Based on the response to UCAN's [October 27, 2011] motion [for party status, with Vote Solar's support] and comment at the PHC, I believe that the issue of whether to establish a NUC should not be included within the scope of this GRC proceeding." Vote Solar, in its November 07, 2011 Protest, at page 4, stated that the NUC were "additional charges in a manner that is directly contrary to state law and state policy . . .". From early on, Vote Solar contributed to the Commission's consideration and position regarding the Network Use Charge portion of the application.</p>
<p>Vote Solar contended the NUC</p>	<p>Commissioner Ferron’s Ruling at p. 7 expressed his concern that “this particular NUC charge may be inconsistent with law” based on an</p>	<p>Accepted.</p>

<p>proposal was illegal and contrary to Public Utilities Code Section 2827(g).</p>	<p>analysis of Section 2827(g). That section “provides that a utility may not create a ‘new charge’ that would increase an eligible customer generator’s costs beyond those of other customers in the same rate class who are not eligible”</p>	
	<p>Vote Solar’s Response to UCAN’s motion provided the Commission a legal analysis of the plain language of Section 2827(g). Vote Solar explained that the purpose of that section was twofold: (1) to ensure that net metering tariffs were identical for customer-generators and non-customer-generators; and (2) to protect customer-generators against any “new” charges. Vote Solar Response at p. 2.</p> <p>Vote Solar further explained that the Legislature prohibited “ ‘any other charge’ that would increase the costs faced by customer-generators when compared to non-customer-generators in the same rate class.” Vote Solar Response at p. 3.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p>
<p>Vote Solar contended that the NUC proposal was discriminatory because, although it applied to all customers, the charge on exports could only apply to customer-generators.</p>	<p>Commissioner Ferron’s Ruling observed that the “new charge” would apply differently to customer-generators and non-customer-generators, as the former would pay a charge on “both incoming and outgoing power...”. Ruling at p. 7.</p> <p>Vote Solar’s Protest argued that the proposal to “collect revenue from NEM customer based on the export of [electricity]” imposes discriminatory treatment that is prohibited under Section 2827(g). Vote Solar Protest at p. 3.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Vote Solar's November 07, 2011 Protest, at page 3, stated that the "plain language of [Pub. Util. Code § 2927(g)] makes unmistakably clear the Legislature's intent that [Net Energy Metering] customers are to be protected from any charge that would increase their costs beyond those faced by other customers that have not installed on-site generation. SDG&amp;E's proposal . . . imposes just the type of discriminatory treatment that the</p>

		<p>Legislature intended to prohibit. . . “. The Assigned Commissioner's Ruling on January 18, 2012, at page 7, was concerned that the NUC charge would be discriminatory in the same manner.</p>
<p>Vote Solar contended that removing SDG&amp;E’s illegal NUC proposal from its general rate case application would serve administrative efficiency.</p>	<p>Commissioner Ferron’s Ruling ordered SDG&amp;E to re-file its application without the NUC charge. Ruling at p. 9.</p> <p>Vote Solar noted that UCAN’s motion was ripe for consideration and that “judicial and administrative economy counsel for rejection of [the NUC]... as illegal and inappropriate for further consideration by the Commission or parties to this case.” Vote Solar Response at p.4.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Vote Solar, as stated in its request for intervenor compensation, took the position (in its November 09, 2011 Response that removal of the NUC element would be consistent with "judicial and administrative economy." This statement preceded the Assigned Commissioner's Ruling requiring the exclusion of the NUC.</p>
<p>Vote Solar contended that SDG&amp;E’s rationales for justifying the NUC were irrelevant and that the proposal should be rejected at the outset because it was inconsistent with Public Utilities Code Section 2827.</p>	<p>Commissioner Ferron’s Ruling notes that “I am concerned that this particular NUC charge may be inconsistent with current law, regardless of whether it is justified by cost causation principles or an analysis of the cross-subsidies inherent in current rates.” Ruling at p. 7.</p> <p>Vote Solar’s Response to UCAN’s motion noted that “the rationales offered by SDG&amp;E for seeking to impose the Network Use Charge are irrelevant in determining the legality of the [NUC] proposed by SDG&amp;E.” Vote Solar Response at p. 4.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>As noted, above, Vote Solar's Protest, at page 3, alleged that the proposed NUC violated the legislative intent behind § 2927(g) of the California Public Utilities Code, which protects NEM customers from discrimination.</p>

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

	<b>Claimant</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<b>a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Verified.</b>
<b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Verified.</b>
<b>c. If so, provide name of other parties: Utility Consumer Action Network (UCAN), Solar Alliance, Sierra Club, San Diego Solar Coalition</b>		<b>Verified.</b>
<b>d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication:</b> Vote Solar’s initial focus in this proceeding was on SD&GE’s proposed: (1) Network Use Charge; and (2) residential rate design changes, including a monthly Basic Service Fee and consolidation of rate Tiers 3 & 4. The majority of Vote Solar’s activity in this proceeding occurred early and Vote Solar’s early focus was to provide a legal basis for the Commission to remove SDG&E’s NUC charge from consideration in this application. Vote Solar discussed and coordinated its approach to opposing the NUC proposal and its concern with residential rate design proposals on net metered customers with other interested intervenors. Given the fact that legal analysis was an essential element of Vote Solar’s work on the NUC proposal, it was necessary for Vote Solar to put forward its own unique presentation of the legal arguments against the NUC proposal. In this way, Vote Solar’s presentation of its legal analysis of the NUC proposal complemented the presentation of other parties. Accordingly, Vote Solar coordinated with other parties to the extent possible and made a conscientious effort to avoid duplication of effort.		<b>Verified.</b>

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**

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

<b>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:</b>  Vote Solar’s cost of participation of \$31,239.75 bears a reasonable relation to the benefit of defeating SDG&E’s NUC charge and preserving bill savings for existing NEM customer-generators. Under SDG&E’s original application, and as pointed out in Vote Solar’s Protest and in the Response to UCAN’s motion, the NUC would increase the amount that customer-generators would pay each month on their electric bills. This, in turn, would likely have a negative impact on the further growth of the distributed generation market in SDG&E’s territory and could have discouraged or dampened the rate of growth. While it is difficult to estimate the precise benefit of defeating the NUC for existing SDG&E customer-generators, there is no question that existing customer-generators would have seen a significant decrease in bill savings	<b><u>CPUC Verified</u></b>  Verified.
---	--

<sup>1</sup> The Division of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Office of Ratepayer Advocates effective September 26, 2013, pursuant to Senate Bill No. 96 (Budget Act of 2013: public resources), which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.

<p>and would have lost the benefit of their investment in a NEM system.</p> <p>To put the potential negative impact of the NUC proposal in context, it is important to consider that SDG&amp;E had over 17,000 residential customers on NEM tariffs around the time it filed its application. <i>See</i> California Net Energy Metering Ratepayer Impacts Evaluation at p. 25 (October 2013). Any negative impact of the NUC proposal on customer bill savings would be felt across this large number of affected customers, as it would create a new charge for exported energy that could not be avoided. While the record was not developed enough to precisely determine the extent of the impact, SDG&amp;E’s application, itself, characterized the NUC proposal as being able to “substantially reduce Cross-subsidies” that SDG&amp;E claimed to be associated with net metering in its service territory. SDG&amp;E Witness Brill, Chapter 1, TRB-12 (October 2011). Considering that the illustrative bill impacts of the NUC proposal put forward in SDG&amp;E’s application range from \$9/month to \$25/month, [<i>See</i> Chapter 2, Yunker, Appendix B (October 2011)] the cumulative financial impact would be quite significant when multiplied by the over 17,000 customers that had invested in NEM systems in SDG&amp;E’s territory by the end of 2011. Vote Solar’s cost of participation, thus, bears a reasonable relation to the size of even the most conservative estimate of customer-generator bill impacts that were avoided by virtue of the defeat of the NUC proposal.</p> <p>Additionally, Vote Solar’s participation and opposition to the NUC helped to set a precedent that discourages the other investor-owned utilities from seeking a similar charge. In this sense, Vote Solar’s participation helped to rebuff an investor-owned utility from establishing a precedent that Section 2827(g) does not protect customer-generators from discriminatory charges such as the NUC. The cost of Vote Solar’s participation is also reasonable in light of this outcome.</p>	
<p><b>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.</b></p> <p>With a focus on residential rate design issues and the NUC, Vote Solar originally estimated that its participation through the entire Phase 2 cycle of this general rate case would be approximately \$213,000. Vote Solar, as indicated in its NOI, recognized that estimating the cost of participation would be difficult since one of the central issues for Vote Solar (the NUC proposal) faced threshold legal challenges and would potentially be removed from the case prior to hearings. Vote Solar, accordingly, kept its time to a minimum for its early review of SDG&amp;E’s application and testimony and its longer-term litigation efforts (such as discovery). Given Vote Solar’s contribution to defeating the NUC in these preliminary pleadings, Vote Solar was able to eliminate a substantial portion of its estimated litigation expenses.</p> <p>After the Commissioner’s Ruling rejected the NUC proposal as out of scope, Vote Solar felt that it was necessary to remain engaged in the case until it could evaluate whether its continued involvement would produce sufficient benefits to justify the expense of litigation. In order to make this evaluation, Vote Solar continued to review filings, cooperatively met with other parties, prepared strategies, and analyzed SDG&amp;E’s re-filed application and testimony in February and March of 2012.</p> <p>By minimizing its expenses while it evaluated the merits of further participation, Vote Solar contained its expenses to those that were necessary to produce a substantial contribution (the elimination of the NUC proposal) and to ensure that SDG&amp;E’s</p>	<p>Verified, <i>but see</i> CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments, below.</p>

<p>re-filed application did not reverse that benefit. Accordingly, Vote Solar’s total hours spent in this proceeding is reasonable in light of the fact that it was able to achieve its primary objective, and substantially contribute to Commissioner Ferron’s ruling, while spending only a fraction of its total estimated hours that would have been required for full litigation of the NUC proposal.</p>										
<p><b>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue</b></p> <p>Vote Solar has split its time by issue into two categories: (A) NUC Proposal; (B) Residential Rate Design, which is a broader category that captures the general tasks associated with participating in a general rate case proceeding. Vote Solar notes that it has assigned hours to the NUC Proposal category where those hours are discrete and easily identifiable, but that some work and analysis related to the NUC proposal is difficult to separate from the hours spent on more “general participation” tasks (i.e., under category “B”). Vote Solar has provided its good faith estimates in allocating time entries by issue.</p> <p><b>A. NUC Proposal:</b> Legal and factual analysis of SDG&amp;E’s NUC Proposal as it relates to Section 2827 of the California Public Utilities Code.</p> <p><b>B. Residential Rate Design:</b> Legal and factual analysis of SDG&amp;E’s Phase 2 residential rate design proposals. This category includes consideration of the impact of SDG&amp;E’s proposed basic service fee and rate tier consolidation on residential NEM customers, review of filings, participating in conference calls with other intervenors, attending meetings or hearings, addressing procedural matters, and all other activities necessary to participate in the proceeding.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="240 1113 1122 1226"> <thead> <tr> <th>Issue</th> <th>Total Hours</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>34.1</td> <td>26%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>95</td> <td>74%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Issue	Total Hours	Percentage	A	34.1	26%	B	95	74%	<p>Verified.</p> <p>The Commission notes that many of Vote Solar’s hours related to “residential rate design” did not contribute to the Commission’s decision in this proceeding and are not compensated. See CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments, below.</p>
Issue	Total Hours	Percentage								
A	34.1	26%								
B	95	74%								

**B. Specific Claim:\***

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours [1][2]	Rate \$	Total \$
Kevin T. Fox, Attorney	2011	8.3	\$285	D.13-10-017; D.12-04-02	\$2,365.50	1.8	\$285.00	541.50
Joseph F. Wiedman, Attorney	2011	23.4	\$285	D.12-04-042	\$6,669	15.3	\$285.00	4,360.50
Joseph F.	2012	15.9	\$290	D.12-04-042;	\$4,611	00.00	\$290.00	00.00

Wiedman, Attorney				ALJ-281 (2.2% Cost-of-Living Adjustment)				
Erica S. McConnell, Attorney	2011	2.1	\$185	Attachment 2	\$388.50	2.1	\$185.00 [3]	388.50
Tim Lindl, Attorney	2012	35.2	\$200	Attachment 2	\$7,100	1.0	\$155.00 <i>See</i> D.14-10- 022.	155.00
Thadeus B. Culley, Attorney	2011	23.6	\$185	D.13-10-017	\$4,366	11.6	\$185.00	2,146.00
Thadeus B. Culley, Attorney	2012	6	\$190	D.13-10-017	\$1,140	00.00	\$190.00	00.00
Gwen Rose, Expert	2011	8.8	\$150	D.12-04-042	\$1,320	6.5	\$150.00	975.00
Gwen Rose, Expert	2012	2.5	\$150	D.12-04-042	\$375	00.00	\$155.00 [4]	00.00
<b>Subtotal: \$ 28,335</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$ 8,566.50</b>		
<b>OTHER FEES</b>								
<b>Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):</b>								
<b>Item</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Rate \$</b>	<b>Basis for Rate*</b>	<b>Total \$</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Total \$</b>
Joseph F. Wiedman	2011	1.8	\$142.5	50% of approved 2011 rate	\$256.50	1.8	\$142.50	256.50
Joseph F. Wiedman	2012	.8	\$145	50% of 2012 rate	\$116	.8	\$145.00	116.00
Erica S. McConnell	2011	5.9	\$92.5	50% of claimed 2011 hourly rate	\$545.75	3.9 [5]	\$92.50	360.75
Tim Lindl	2012	10.2	\$100	Attachment 2	\$1,020	6.2 [6]	\$77.50	480.50
Tim Lindl	2014	1.4	\$100	Attachment 2	\$140	1.4	\$100.00 [7]	140.00
Thadeus B. Culley	2014	8.7	\$95	50% of rate approved in D.13-10-017	\$826.50	8.7	\$100.00 [8]	870.00
<b>Subtotal: \$ 2,904.75</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$2,223.75</b>		
<b>Total Request: \$31,239.75</b>						<b>Total Award: \$10,790.25</b>		

\*\*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that 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 typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate

#### ATTORNEY INFORMATION

Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR <sup>2</sup>	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation
Kevin T. Fox	June 11, 2008	256609	No
Joseph F. Wiedman	December 1, 2004	234302	No
Tim Lindl	December 4, 2009	267030	No
Erica S. McConnell	December 3, 2010	273560	No
Thadeus B. Culley	December 1, 2010	271602	No

#### C. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:

Item	Reason
[1]	<p>The Commission notes that 25.2 hours were spent preparing, editing, and reviewing Vote Solar's protest. The protest contained only 6 pages of substantive material. For the excessiveness and internal duplication, 5 hours have been removed from Culley's 2011 claim, 5 hours have been removed from Fox's 2011 claim, and 2.3 hours from Rose's claimed hours for 2011.</p> <p>In addition, 11.7 hours were spent preparing, editing, and reviewing Vote Solar's response to UCAN's motion. The response contained only 5 pages of substantive material. 1.4 hours have been removed from Fox's 2011 for excessiveness and internal duplication related to the drafting of the response.</p>
[2]	<p>The Commission notes that Vote Solar filed the response to UCAN's motion on November 17, 2011. In 2012, Vote Solar's only filing was its Notice of Intent to claim intervenor compensation, filed on January 9, 2012. Unlike other parties, Vote Solar did not file an Opening Brief or Comments on the Proposed Decision. Nonetheless, Vote Solar spent over 60 hours conducting research and review. Such hours did not result in any action that assisted the Commission in making a decision in this proceeding. As such, the following hours did not substantially contribute to the decision and have been removed from the award: 7 hours from Culley's 2011 claim; 6 hours from Culley's 2012 claim; 2.5 hours from Rose's 2012 claim; 8.1 hours from Wiedman's 2011 claim; 15.9 hours from Wiedman's 2012 claim; and 34.2 hours from Lindl's 2012 claim.</p>
[3]	<p>Based on the attached justification of hourly rate and Resolution ALJ-281, the Commission approves a rate of \$185 for McConnell in 2011.</p>
[4]	<p>In Resolution ALJ-281, the Commission adopted a cost-of-living adjustment for 2012 of 2.2%. Applying</p>

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

	the COLA to Rose's 2011 rate results in a 2012 rate of \$155, which the Commission now adopts.
[5]	Based on the claimed hours that followed McConnell's finishing of the NOI, it appears McConnell's work was duplicative of the work performed by Lindl. As such, 2 hours have been removed from the award.
[6]	The Commission notes that three attorneys spent 19.5 hours working on the notice of intent for Vote Solar, which is excessive. Lindl spent 6.4 hours on 01/09/2012 to "[a]nalyze SDG&E Application; compile and file NOI; analyze CPUC Rules of Practice and Procedure re same; analyze CPUC Intervenor Compensation Guide re same." 4 hours of this work have been removed from the award.
[7]	The Commission approves a 2014 rate of \$200 for Lindl. Lindl's work in 2014 marks the third year of experience practicing before the Commission.
[8]	In D.13-10-017, the Commission adopted a 2012 rate for Culley of \$190. In Resolution ALJ-287, the Commission adopted a cost-of-living adjustment for 2013 of 2%. Applying the COLA to Culley's 2012 rate resulted in a 2013 rate of \$195. In Resolution ALJ-303, the Commission adopted a 2.58% COLA for 2014. Applying the COLA to Culley's 2013 rate results in a 2014 rate of \$200. The Commission now adopts both the 2013 and 2014 for Culley.

**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))**

<b>A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?</b>	No.
<b>B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (see Rule 14.6(c)(6))?</b>	No.

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion
	No comments were filed.	

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. Vote Solar Initiative has made a substantial contribution to D.14-01-002.
2. The requested hourly rates for Vote Solar Initiative's 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 are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$10,790.25.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

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

**ORDER**

1. Vote Solar Initiative is awarded \$10,790.25.

2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, San Diego Gas & Electric Company shall pay Vote Solar Initiative 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 June 4, 2014, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of Vote Solar's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision is not waived.

4. This decision is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, at San Francisco, California.

## APPENDIX

## Compensation Decision Summary Information

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>		<b>Modifies Decision?</b>	
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D1401002		
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	A1110002		
<b>Author:</b>	ALJs Stephen C. Roscow, Amy C. Yip-Kikugawa		
<b>Payer(s):</b>	San Diego Gas & Electric Company		

## Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Vote Solar Initiative	March 21, 2014	\$ 31,239.75	\$10,790.25	N/A	See CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments, above.

## Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Erica	McConnell	Attorney	Vote Solar Initiative	\$185	2011	\$185.00
Gwen	Rose	Expert	Vote Solar Initiative	\$150	2011	\$150.00
Gwen	Rose	Expert	Vote Solar Initiative	\$150	2012	\$155.00
Joseph	Wiedman	Attorney	Vote Solar Initiative	\$285	2011	\$285.00
Joseph	Wiedman	Attorney	Vote Solar Initiative	\$290	2012	\$290.00
Kevin	Fox	Attorney	Vote Solar Initiative	\$285	2011	\$285.00
Tim	Lindl	Attorney	Vote Solar Initiative	\$200	2012	\$155.00
Tim	Lindl	Attorney	Vote Solar Initiative	\$200	2014	\$200.00
Thadeus	Culley	Attorney	Vote Solar Initiative	\$185	2011	\$185.00
Thadeus	Culley	Attorney	Vote Solar Initiative	\$190	2012	\$190.00
Thadeus	Culley	Attorney	Vote Solar Initiative	N/A	2013	\$195.00
Thadeus	Culley	Attorney	Vote Solar Initiative	\$190	2014	\$200.00

(END OF APPENDIX)