Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ McKINNEY (Mailed 9/22/2016)**

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion to Conduct a Comprehensive Examination of Investor Owned Electric Utilities' Residential Rate Structures, the Transition to Time Varying and Dynamic Rates, and Other Statutory Obligations	Rulemaking 12-06-013 (Filed June 21, 2012

DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO VOTE SOLAR FOR SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION TO D.15-07-001

Intervenor: Vote Solar	**For contribution to Decision (D.) 15-07-001**
Claimed: $ $409,197.55	**Awarded: $~~243,443.91~~243,785.84 (~~40.5~~40.4% reduction)**
Assigned Commissioner: Michael Picker	**Assigned ALJ(s): Jeanne M. McKinney, Julie M. Halligan**

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	Decision 15-07-001 marks the culmination of a three-year long examination of proposed residential rate reforms for the three major investor-owned utilities in California. The Decision makes changes intended to allow a more accurate allocation of costs between lower- and higher-usage customers. The Decision addresses major residential rate components, including tier consolidation, fixed charges, and optional and default time-of-use ("TOU") rates. The Decision makes modifications to the IOU's inclining block rate structure, reducing the number of tiers from four to two and reducing the rate differential between tiers. Additionally, the Decision creates a new super user surcharge for those customers consuming 400% over baseline. For these rate changes, the Decision adopts a glidepath easing customers into the new price structure between 2015 and 2019. The Decision moves California towards default TOU rates in 2019, and adopts new optional TOU rates. The Decision rejects the IOU's request to immediately include fixed charges in the rate design, and instead adopts a minimum

	bill.

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

	Intervenor	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference (PHC):	Oct. 24, 2012	Verified.
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	Nov. 26, 2012 (See ALJ Ruling on NOIs, dated Feb. 25, 2013, at p. 24, finding timely NOI was timely filed.)	Verified.
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	See I.C. below.
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	March 3, 2011 (See ALJ Ruling on NOIs, dated Feb. 25, 2013, at p. 25, finding Vote Solar is a customer)	See I.C. below.
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	Please see Part C.	We consider Vote Solar's customer status in this decision.
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes.
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.12-06-013	See I.C. below.
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	Feb. 25, 2013	See I.C. below.
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	See also D.15-06-022, D.13-07-046	We consider Vote Solar's significant financial hardship in this decision.
12. 12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship? Yes.		Yes.

Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.15-07-001	D.15-07-001
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	July 13, 2015	July 13, 2015
15. File date of compensation request:	August 31, 2015	Yes.
16. Was the request for compensation timely?	Yes.	Yes.

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
	Regarding Vote Solar's customer status, at the start of 2015 Vote Solar amended and restated its bylaws and articles of incorporation. These amended governance documents were submitted to the Commission on March 20, 2015 as part of Vote Solar's NOI in R.14-10-003. Through the revised NOI in R.14-10-003, Vote Solar reaffirms its status as a "Category 3" customer as its articles of incorporation and bylaws continue to provide that the organization is authorized to represent the interest of its members that receive residential electric service in proceedings before state agencies when related to Vote Solar's organizational purpose. The Administrative Law Judge for R.14-10-003 has not issued a determination on Vote Solar's revised NOI at the time of the submission of this claim for compensation.	In R.14-10-003, the ALJ ruling issued on 2/19/15 on Vote Solar's initial NOI filed on 1/2/15, which rejected the initial NOI stating that it was deficient in demonstrating its customer status and financial hardship. The ALJ Ruling provided guidance requesting the following: • Customer Status: Under Section 1802(b)(1)(c), Vote Solar must provide a document under its bylaws or statement of incorporation which states the organization's purpose as being to represent the interests of residential customers or small commercial customers. • Significant Hardship: o Provide a list of any corporations or organizations, and their percentage, within membership of Vote Solar. o Provide a list of any groups, organizations, or corporations with which Vote Solar has partnered with and the purposes of the partnership, arrangement, or relationship. o Vote Solar's most recent annual income and expense statement and balance sheet. The ALJ ruling allowed Vote Solar to file an amended NOI within 30 days of the ruling or 15 days of the issuance of a revised Scoping Memo and Ruling. Vote Solar submitted its Amended NOI on 3/20/15, accompanied by the following supporting documents: 1. Vote Solar's Articles of Incorporations submitted to the California Secretary of State 12/30/13,

		2. The Amended and Restated Bylaws of Vote Solar, dated 3/3/15. 3. Vote Solar's 2013 Income and expense statement and balance sheet. In Attachment 1(Articles of Incorporation), Section 6 clearly states Vote Solar's role of representing residential ratepayers and identifies Vote Solar is a nonprofit public benefit corporation. The articles of incorporation state, "The specific and primary purpose of this corporation is to engage in charitable and educational activities within the meaning of Section 501(c) (3) of the Internal revenue Code of 1986, as amended, or the corresponding provisions of any future United States internal revenue law (the "Code"), including but not limited to fighting climate change and fostering economic opportunity by promoting solar energy." This provides us the information we requested in the ALJ Ruling of 2/19/15 to address customer eligibility specified in Section 1802(b)(1)(c). The Amended NOI also responded to the ALJ Ruling's requested information, in III.B., its explanation of its Significant Hardship showing: • Corporate or Organizational Membership: Vote Solar states that its membership does not include corporations and/or organizations, but rather entirely of individuals who sign up online or at events. • Corporate or Organizational Partnerships: Vote Solar identifies two formal partnerships: 1) Co-producing the Freeing the Grid report with the Interstate Renewable energy Council (IREC) and 2) Vote Solar's Group Energy Program. Regarding the Group Energy Program, Vote Solar states that it represents less than 10% of its overall budget and do not fund Vote Solar's regulatory work at the CPUC. Vote Solar identifies the following projects and sponsors: o SF SunShares Round II sponsored by the City and County of San Francisco Department of the Environment. o CaliforniaFIRST Sunshares sponsored by Renewable Funding. o Solar Chicago (a World Wildlife Fund Grant) sponsored by the City of Chicago, o NYSERDA (grant funded) with

		Sustainable CUNY, o Peninsular SunShares sponsored by Foster City, o U.S. DOE Solar Energy Evolution and Diffusion Studies (SEEDS) Program.
		Vote Solar's Amended NOI on 3/20/15 has demonstrated that it meets the eligibility requirements for customer status under 1802(b)(1)(c), as a Category 3 customer. Vote Solar has also satisfactorily addressed the concerns in the ALJ ruling of 2/19/15 in R.14-10-003 regarding its showing of significant hardship and customer status.

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (*see* § 1802(i), § 1803(a), and D.98-04-059).

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
1. Vote Solar proposed that existing, revenue-neutral TOU rates remain open to allow continued residential investment in solar PV, and that optional TOU rates already closed or that would be closed at the conclusion of Phase 1 be grandfathered for customers for a time that allows recovery of solar investments. Where the Commission closes currently open optional TOU rate schedules, Vote Solar proposed that net energy metered ("NEM") customers be grandfathered on those rates for a period that allows recovery of their solar investment.	**Exh. Vote Solar-101** (Dir. Test. Of William Monsen), *passim*; **Vote Solar Opening Brief**, dated Jan. 5, 2015, pp. 1-2, 12-25; **Comments on the Proposed Decision ("PD")**, dated May 11, 2015, pp. 4-6. **D.15-07-001, pdf, pp. 151, 155-157, 331 (Concl. of Law No. 43):** The Decision concluded that customers on E-6 should be grandfathered on that rate, as requested by Vote Solar. Specifically, the Decision set a five-year transition period for PG&E's E-6 rate schedule that allows customers to be grandfathered on that rate for the transition period after the rate is closed. The Decision also applied the five-year transition period for SDG&E's optional DR-TOU rate schedule, which was closed in January 2015. The Decision states: "[SEIA and Vote Solar] argue that because solar customers made investments based on these rate	Vote Solar's recommendation is consistent with the decision as the decision grandfathered customers on E-6, but differed in that the Commission concluded that the transition period would end five years from January 2016. The decision did not adopt Vote Solar's "solar friendly" TOU option, but Vote Solar did contribute to the approach adopted in the final decision. Although Vote Solar contributed, its work was duplicative of SEIA, as the two

	structures and rate differentials, customers that are currently on TOU rates should be grandfathered onto those rate structures. Vote Solar argues that making significant changes to rate structures, by, for example, adding a new demand charge or customer charge, could have significant impacts on the customer's PV investment." (D.15-07-001 at p. 151.) "To the extent that the Commission decides to close currently open TOU tariffs, Vote Solar requests that the Commission grandfather those existing NEM customers that are currently taking service under the tariff and that grandfathered customers should be permitted to continue service on closed TOU rates for a period consistent with the payback period established by D.14-03-041." (D.15-07-001 at p. 151.) "We are endeavoring to avoid abrupt changes here through a variety of approaches, but recognize that individual hardships may nonetheless occur. We seek to avoid that outcome to the greatest degree possible. We are sympathetic to the challenges faced by individual customers who have elected to install rooftop solar. As Vote Solar and others point out, these individual TOU customers may have made the investment in solar assuming that the TOU rate would not change. Rooftop solar installations are often designed to maximize generation during the TOU rate peak periods that were in place at the time of installation. In keeping with the RDPs of customer acceptance and energy efficiency, we believe the impact of changing or closing TOU tariffs should be mitigated. Given the number of significant	solar groups shared the same position on TOU rates.

	changes we are adopting, including tier flattening and increased use of minimum bills, and given the need for customer acceptance, we also find that the transition period for PG&E's E-6 tariff and SDG&E's DR-TOU tariff should be at least five years from January 1, 2016." (D.15-07-001 at p. 155.) "In order to provide for a gradual transition to new TOU periods and rate schedules, customers on PG&E's E-6 and EL-6 rate schedules should be allowed to remain on those tariffs for a transition period that extends for at least five years after the respective tariff is closed to new customers." (D.15-07-001 at p. 331 (Concl. of Law No. 43).)	
2. Vote Solar opposed SDG&E's structural changes to DR-TOU that included a fixed charge, and Vote Solar brought to light SDG&E's effort outside this proceeding to eliminate this optional TOU rate. •"[T]he PD is correct that SDG&E's rate DR-TOU was closed January 2015. At this time, SDG&E is proposing to eliminate DR-TOU in Phase 2 of its General Rate Case….The PD should clarify that the transition period applies to customers on Schedule DR-TOU, as well. SDG&E should not be permitted to avoid the Commission's transition period protections for customers that are	**Opening Brief**, dated Jan. 5, 2015, pp. 23-24; **Comments on the Proposed Decision ("PD")**, dated May 11, 2015, p. 8. **D.15-07-001, pdf, pp. 155-157:** •The Decision included clarifications from the Proposed Decision's ("PD") discussion of SDG&E's DR-TOU rate schedule by applying the five-year transition period for DR-TOU. (See p. 157.)	The Commission adopted a transition period of at least five years for SDG&E's DR-TOU rate, similar to PG&E's E-6 tariff, to stabilize the effects of other rate changes (i.e. tier flattening and minimum bills). *See* discussion above II.A.1.

established in this proceeding by proposing to eliminate Schedule DR-TOU outside of this proceeding." (Comments on the PD at p. 8) • "Vote Solar recommends that SDG&E keep versions of DR-TOU and DR-SES as currently structured, meaning that SDG&E not add the monthly service fees and that DR-TOU remain a four-tiered rate with current rate differentials." (Opening Brief at pp. 23-24.)	•The Decision also clarified that the minimum bill approved for the default tariff must also apply to existing TOU rates, such as DR-TOU. (See p. 155.)	
3. Vote Solar recommended that the Commission ensure that its directions and periods for transitioning customers taking service on closed TOU rates are clear. Vote Solar recommended a precise closure date and proposed that new NEM customers with pending interconnection requests should be eligible for closed TOU rates. • "To remove the potential for confusion and to be consistent with the apparent intention of the PD, the PD should be revised so that it is clear that E-6 may not be restructured prior to closure, and the Commission's chosen transition period for PG&Es closed or closing TOU rates starts on January 1, 2016." (Comments on the PD at pp. 6-7.) • "[T]he PD should also clarify that customers with pending	**Vote Solar Comments on the PD**, dated May 11, 2015, pp. 2, 6-8; **Vote Solar Reply to Comments on the PD**, dated May 18, 2015, p. 1 (reiterating a proposal of a concise January 1, 2016 date for the closure of rates.) **D.15-07-001, pdf, pp. 155-157.** •As recommended by Vote Solar, the Decision sets a precise date of January 1, 2016 for closure of PG&E's E-6 rate schedule and SDG&E's DR-TOU rate schedule. (D.15-07-001 at p. 157.) •The Decision finds that "those residential PG&E customers with	Vote Solar repeats an argument it makes in support of its position to grandfather TOU rates for existing customers in #1. This claimed contribution is subsumed in #1. *See* II.A.1.

interconnection requests selecting an E-6 rate will be allowed to take service on E-6 in the case where the processing of the interconnection request is finished after the closure of the E-6 rate to new customers." (Comments on the PD at p. 7.) •Vote Solar pointed out that application of a five year transition from the date of closure for PG&E's E-7 rate, which was closed in 2008, was nonsensical as the five years would have passed. (Comments on the PD at p. 8.)	pending interconnection requests selecting an E-6 rate will be allowed to take service on E-6 in the case where the processing of the interconnection request is finished after E-6 is officially closed." (D.15-07-001 at pp. 155-156.) •For E-7, the Decision recognizes the PD's error in applying a five-year transition to the 2008 closure date for this rate, which was pointed out by Vote Solar, and removes the application of a five-year transition period from this rate. "E-7 has been closed since 2008 and may also be eliminated in 2016." (D.15-07-001 at p. 155.)	
4. Vote Solar described the importance of respecting and protecting residential customers' solar investments and solar customers' contributions to California's clean energy goals. Vote Solar strongly opposed the use of unsupported assertions and allegations regarding solar customers that were not in evidence. • "[T]he PD presumes, without record support, that customers who install rooftop solar 'may actually increase usage to maximize perceived benefits from having their own energy source.' Similarly, the PD states that 'solar customers may choose to reduce conservation given they no longer pay the utility for all of their electricity.' These topics were not litigated in this	**Vote Solar Opening Brief**, dated Jan. 5, 2015, pp. 4-5; **Vote Solar Comments on the PD**, dated May 11, 2015, pp. 13-14 (noting presumptive and unsupported statements regarding NEM customer behaviors in the PD), Appx A (suggesting changes to Findings of Fact). **D.15-07-001, pdf, p. 102, 193, 322-323.** •The Decision deletes the statement from page 97 of the PD that "[f]or the customers who do invest in solar, the inclining block rate no longer provides them with motivation to conserve energy." Also, the Decision no longer contains the statement from the PD's page 97 that improperly presumed "solar customers may choose to reduce conservation given that they no longer pay the utility for all of their electricity." (at p. 102)	Accepted.

proceeding, and there is no evidence in the record to substantiate these theories. Accordingly, they should be deleted." (Vote Solar Comments on PD at p. 13, citing PD page 97.) • "The PD alleges in several places that NEM customers as a group are subsidized by other customers. This is not substantiated by the record in this proceeding, nor has the Commission found that NEM constitutes a subsidy in any other proceeding. Additionally, it is inappropriate for the PD to contain conclusions regarding any subsidies between NEM and other customers because the costs and benefits of NEM from various ratepayer perspectives are being considered in R.14-07-002, and to do so prejudices the outcome of that proceeding. Vote Solar therefore requests that the PD be revised to remove these inappropriate representations regarding solar NEM customers. (Vote Solar Comments on the PD at p. 14, citing PD at pp. 172, 291, and 292.)	•The Decision modifies the PD's sentence at PD page 172 to remove the blanket presumption that net energy metered ("NEM") customers "do not have volumetric usage and thus do not pay anything towards fixed costs incurred on their behalf." The Decision now states that "some customers (such as vacation home owners and some solar PV owners) have minimal volumetric usage and thus often pay comparatively little towards fixed costs incurred on their behalf." (D.15-07-001 at p. 193.) The Decision modifies the PD's Findings of Fact Nos. 163, 164, 179 and 180 (PD at pp. 291-292), as reflected in the Decision's Findings of Fact Nos. 162, 163, 177, and 178. The Findings of Fact in the Decision remove statements indicating that NEM customers do not pay their share of fixed costs or that NEM customers are subsidized. (D. 15-07-001 at pp. 322, 323.)	
5. Vote Solar recommended a gradual transition to a default TOU rate structure with a baseline credit. • "The default rate should be a TOU rate design which reflects	**Rate Design Proposal of Solar Energy Industries Association and the Vote Solar Initiative ("Joint Rate Design Proposal")**, dated May 29, 2013, pp. 9, 12, 21-22. **D.15-07-001, pdf, pp. 96-97, 136-140, 331 (Concl. of Law No. 45)**. •The Decision adopted a baseline credit for default TOU rates, as recommended	Vote Solar did not provide a unique contribution. It supported SEIA's proposal.[1]

[1] D.15-07-007 at, 105; 1/5/15 Opening Brief at 2.

how utility costs vary throughout the day….Finally, the 'optimal' rate design should retain both the baseline and CARE discounts." (Joint Rate Design Proposal at p. 9.)	by Vote Solar. "There are policy reasons why a baseline tier (or baseline credit or excess surcharge) is desirable." (D.15-07-001 at p. 97) "We should adopt a baseline credit on any default TOU rate and on at least one available TOU optional rate, as well as any TOU pilot rates." (D.15-07-001 at p. 331 (Concl. of Law No. 45).)	
6. Vote Solar joined other parties in recommending pilot testing prior to large-scale implementation of a default TOU rate.	**Vote Solar Opening Brief**, dated Jan. 5, 2015, pp. 25-26. **D.15-07-001, pdf, pp. 165, 166, 170, 172.** The Decision ordered a default pilot prior to full roll-out of a default TOU rate. "[A] number of active parties argue for a two-year default pilot prior to any large-scale implementation of default TOU. These parties state that a default TOU pilot would allow further study of the topics above." (D.15-07-001 at p. 165.) "[W]e recognize that agreement between diverse parties on an approach to default TOU design has significant value. We find that a collaborative approach, such as that recommended by the parties, will benefit the design and roll out of default TOU." (D.15-07-001 at p. 166.) "[B]ecause we agree there are benefits to default TOU pilots, we require each IOU to include a default TOU rate in its design of pilots approved by this decision." (D.15-07-001 at p. 170.)	No contribution. Vote Solar's participation in the Joint Parties' recommendation of a pilot project was addressed in an ALJ Ruling on December 24, 2014, denying the joint motion to admit the joint exhibit into the record. As the work on the Joint Parties' proposal was not admitted into the record, it did not contribute to the proceeding and Vote Solar will not be compensated for the time spent on this work. The other citation Vote Solar provides for this issue consists of one paragraph in its Opening Comments which references the stricken proposal.
7. Vote Solar opposed imposition of a fixed charge.	**Joint Rate Design Proposal**, dated May 29, 2013, pp 13-14; **Vote Solar**	For this element of residential rate

When deciding between application of a minimum bill and a fixed charge, Vote solar recommended application of a minimum bill to residential customers. • "Although the utilities seek the highest possible [fixed charge] amounts, the Commission is not required to approve any new or expanded fixed charges, and may consider whether minimum bills are appropriate as a substitute." (Opening Brief at p. 10.) • "The rate design should avoid the use of rate elements, such as monthly fixed or demand charges, to which the customer has no ability to respond, except to move off the grid….The Commission should recognize that rate design policies will have significant implication for customer-side programs (EE, DR, and DG), and that fixed charges limit customers' options to impact their energy bills through long-term investments in these preferred resource options." (Joint Rate Design Proposal at p. 13.) "[I]f the Commission shifts the recovery of costs currently collected via volumetric charges to fixed charges, residential customers will have less incentive to undertake	**Opening Brief**, dated Jan. 5, 2015, pp. 10-11; **Vote Solar Comments on the PD**, dated May 11, 2015, pp. 10-11. **D.15-07-001, pdf, pp. 56, 155, 206, 216, 217, 227, 328 (Concl. of Law No. 19), 329 (Concl. of Law No. 329).** The Decision rejected the utilities' proposed fixed charges and adopted a minimum bill, instead. • "…[M]any parties oppose any rate structure with a fixed charge. These parties point out that fixed charges to reflect fixed costs are permitted, but not required, by statute." (D.15-07-001 at p. 206.) • "According to TURN and ORA, along with the solar parties, high fixed charges in particular will lead to energy efficiency programs that are less effective or more costly, or both." (D.15-07-001 at p. 56.)	design, Vote Solar argued in favor of a minimum bill rather than a fixed charge. The decision ultimately found that in principal a fixed charge is reasonable. However, for a variety of reasons, including those raised by Vote Solar, the decision did not approve a fixed charge. Instead, as recommended by Vote Solar, the decision adopted the minimum bill. However, Vote Solar was one of numerous parties that argued for the minimum bill. Vote Solar's contribution on this issue was not unique.

energy saving behaviors, and as a result, are less likely to conserve or install renewable distributed generation." (Opening Brief at pp. 10-11.) • "If the Commission must choose between a fixed charge or a minimum bill, Vote Solar finds that minimum bills are the better of the two approaches. Minimum bills are a preferred and appropriate substitute for fixed charges as they can ensure recovery of fixed costs yet have a much smaller impact on conservation and energy efficiency." (Opening Brief at p. 11.) • "The PD…creates uncertainty on which of the two charges [fixed charge or minimum bill] will be applied to the closed TOU rate schedules or when such charges would be applied….To avoid unnecessary confusion and adjustment of these tiered TOU rates, the Commission should only apply a minimum bill for closed TOU rates subject to the transition period." (Opening Brief at pp. 10-11.)	• "Adopting a minimum bill in lieu of a fixed charge at this time is reasonable." (D.15-07-001 at p. 328 (Concl. of Law No. 19).) • "The minimum bill approved for the default tariff must also apply to existing TOU rates including E-6." (D.15-07-001 at p. 155, compare to PD statement at page 143 that states "[t]he minimum bill or fixed charge approved for the default tariff must also apply to existing TOU rates including E-6 and E-7.)	
8. Vote Solar opposed the IOUs inclining block rate proposals with a 20% differential between tiers, and argued for a steeper differential. Vote Solar also supported a reduction in the number of tiers.	**Joint Rate Design Proposal**, dated May 29, 2013, pp 17-18; **Vote Solar Opening Brief**, dated Jan. 5, 2015, pp. 9-10. **D.15-07-001, pdf, pp. 109, 114, 268-270.** The Decision rejected the utilities 20% differential between tiers, and adopted a higher differential.	Vote Solar proposed a simplified increasing block rate, with a third tier at 130% of baseline quantity. The decision found that a two-tier rate with a 25% differential as optimal. Vote Solar's proposal was not

	"Other parties including…Vote Solar…argue for a steeper differential." (D.15-07-001 at p. 109.) "A two-tier rate with a 25% differential will encourage overall conservation while reducing bill volatility." (D.15-07-001 at p. 114.) "For all three utilities, our approved structure sets an end-state of 2 tiers with a 25% differential on a glidepath that extends to 2019." (D.15-07-001 at p. 270.)	adopted, but it contributed to the discussion and analysis of the tiered rate structure that was ultimately adopted. Many parties advocated tiered-rate structures similar to that proposed by Vote Solar. Vote Solar's contribution on this issue was not unique.
9. Vote Solar recommended that a shortfall or undercollection from customers on rates that resulted in a cross-subsidy be spread among ratepayers.	**Vote Solar Opening Brief**, dated Jan. 5, 2015, pp. 24-25. **D.15-07-001, pdf, pp. 160, 162, 331 (Concl. of Law No. 47).** (at p. 331, Concl. of Law No. 47, "Any revenue shortfall resulting from optional TOU rate schedules should be recovered from all residential customers.")	Accepted.

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

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?[2]	**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: Vote Solar was the only party primarily focused on changes to the IOUs' existing, optional TOU rate schedules, and how changes to those schedules would impact existing NEM customers or remove incentives for future residential investment in solar photovoltaics ("PV"). While no other party's testimony and briefs had the specific focus of Vote Solar, certain parties shared Vote Solar's		*See* below, II.B.d.

[2] 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.

broader interests in ensuring that the rate changes adopted do not adversely affect investments in renewable distributed generation. These parties include the California Solar Energy Industries Association ("CalSEIA"), Environmental Defense Fund ("EDF"), Interstate Renewable Energy Counsel ("IREC"), Natural Resources Defense Council ("NRDC"), Sierra Club, Solar Energy Industries Association ("SEIA"), and The Alliance for Solar Choice ("TASC").	
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: Vote Solar made a significant effort to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts and similarly held positions. Vote Solar coordinated with SEIA by submitting the following jointly with SEIA in this proceeding: • May 29, 2013, Rate Design Proposal of the Solar Energy Industries Association and the Vote Solar Initiative; • July 12, 2013, Comments of the Solar Energy Industries Association and the Vote Solar Initiative on Residential Rate Design Proposals; • July 26, 2013, Reply Comments of the Solar Energy Industries Association and the Vote Solar Initiative on Residential Rate Design Proposals; • December 23, 2013, Protest of the Solar Energy Industries Association and the Vote Solar Initiative to the IOUs Supplemental Rate Design Proposals; and • May 2, 2014, Prehearing Conference Statement of the Solar Energy Industries Association and the Vote Solar Initiative. Vote Solar sought to avoid duplication by discussing the appropriate division of labor with ally groups including SEIA, CALSEIA, TASC, and Sierra Club. Vote Solar was the only party in the proceeding to offer testimony that that addressed in detail the IOUs' existing optional TOU rates and proposals and sought to explain and quantify the importance of these rates for existing residential solar customers. Vote Solar's testimony uniquely discussed the difference between early adopters of solar technologies and new solar customers, and argued for protections for both of these customer groups through the existing, optional TOU rate schedules. Vote Solar avoided duplication by focusing its testimony and advocacy on unique issues not addressed by others, and avoided testimony that overlapped or repeated the testimony of other parties. In addition to the above, Vote Solar joined a ten party joint position that put forth a course to move towards implementation of a default TOU rate. This position was recognized as a valuable consensus position, but not ultimately adopted in full by the Commission. By participating in discussions and joining in this group effort, Vote Solar avoided the duplicative and timely effort that would have been required in taking a	Multiple parties participated in the proceeding representing solar and renewable energy interests, specifically addressing the TOU rate structures. Vote Solar did not offer its own proposals on some of its claimed contributions to TOU rate issues (see #5, tiered rates) but stated its support of other intervenors who developed more of the record. While it is true that Vote Solar and SEIA collaborated on a rate proposal and joint comments, the hours claimed are excessive for the work produced within the proceeding given that the collaboration should have reduced Vote Solar's hours. We discuss reductions for duplication and

solitary position on the process for moving toward a default TOU rate.	excessive time on filings in II.C. and III.D.

C. Additional Comments on Part II:

#	Intervenor's Comment	CPUC Discussion
		Vote Solar adequately represented Net Energy Meter (NEM) customers by providing clarifications regarding the impacts of rate changes to these customers and advocating for the grandfathering of TOU rates for residential solar customers to allow recovery of their solar investment. However, the hours claimed are excessive and duplicative of other solar parties. On other TOU, fixed charge, and inclining block issues, Vote Solar put forth arguments that were less effective and duplicative of other parties on these issues. Vote Solar requests compensation for 11 staff and 1,244 hours. We find the claimed hours highly excessive given the number of filings which Vote Solar produced. Vote Solar collaborated on five joint filings with SEIA, including a rate design proposal and comments. On its own, Vote Solar expanded on the positions that it developed with SEIA but only produced a prehearing conference (PHC) statement, opening and reply briefs, and three sets of comments on the PD and the APD. This demonstrates that the parties failed to adequately coordinate on the NEM/TOU and Inclining Block issues, resulting in duplicative efforts.[3] See II.B.d. Vote Solar describes six categories of issues, which all pertain to TOU rates and impacts to solar customers, and claims significant hours for each individual issue, when in fact work described in the six categories (below) includes similar and overlapping areas of work that constitute one primary issue area - the impacts of rates, mainly TOU rates, to solar customers. Vote Solar requests 905 hours on the following: ▪ 561 hours on investigating whether the IOU TOU rate design proposals harm NEM customers (Issues A,B,C), ▪ 105.6 hours for work on the issue of whether Phase 1 should approve "a move towards a default TOU rate, and if so, what protections should be in place for customers on a default

[3] 2015 Cal. PUC LEXIS 264 (Cal. PUC 2015)

		TOU rate?" (Issue D) ▪ 223.15 hours on "Whether the Commission and the IOUs are adequately considering and representing the contributions and impacts of residential NEM customers". (Issue E) ▪ 15.7 hours for work on a process for moving a default TOU rate (Issue F). Vote Solar also claims excessive hours in two categories for inclining block rates: ▪ 183.7 hours on "Whether a more optimal inclining block rate structure has fewer tiers and a lower diferential between rate tiers" (Issue G). ▪ 68 hours on examining whether the IOUs' proposals for inclining block rates are consistent with rate design and Commission policies, and whether they encourage conservation, energy efficiency, and economic efficient decision making (Issue H). In addition, the issues identified above overlap and the collaboration with SEIA should have reduced the hours spent. We reduce the hours spent on TOU and NEM issues (Issues A, B, C, and E) and Inclining Block Rates (Issue G) by 50% for duplication. We also disallow excessive hours claimed in 2015 on filings, as noted in III.D.8. Finally, Vote Solar includes in its claim a joint default TOU proposal which was not admitted into the record. (See II.A.6)

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness:	CPUC Discussion
Vote Solar recommended movement towards a default TOU rate with a transition toward a more simplified inclining block rate in the interim as part of its long-term rate design proposal. The purpose of this movement towards a default TOU is to encourage conservation, energy efficiency, and the use of renewable distributed generation. Such investment in renewable DG will have a direct financial benefit to all ratepayers. While the amount of this benefit is difficult to quantify, it far exceeds the amount expended by Vote Solar in this proceeding. Vote Solar advocated for protection of the investments made by	Given that Vote Solar focused narrowly on NEM and solar customer interests, the hours claimed are excessive and unreasonable. For some of the claimed contributions, Vote Solar simply stated support for other parties' proposals, and its work duplicates

residential customers in renewable energy systems, and urged the Commission to send consistent messages to existing NEM customers regarding state policy encouraging renewable energy investment. Each residential customer's economic cost of its solar installation and the benefit of their existing rate for the five-year transition period are difficult to calculate, but will certainly in sum be a substantial financial benefit. Vote Solar's advocacy in this proceeding resulted in direct and specific ratepayer benefits for those NEM customers that will be able to continue on PG&E's E-6 rate schedule and SDG&E's DR-TOU rate schedule, each of which are considered more solar friendly than the utilities' newly adopted optional TOU rates. Vote Solar also succeeded in removing language from the Decision that unfairly characterized the conservation behaviors of solar customers. Ultimately, ratepayers have directly benefitted by the above described advocacy of Vote Solar and its focus on environmental concerns and support of residential NEM customers' investments in renewable distributed generation.	other parties. Vote Solar's claim is the highest of the seven intervenor compensation claims filed for this time period. At the same time, Vote Solar contributed on a relatively narrow set of issues compared to other intervenors. The amount claimed by Vote Solar significantly exceeds Vote Solar's NOI estimate of $95,000.

b. Reasonableness of hours claimed: Vote Solar is a small, tightly staffed and budgeted organization with a flat management structure. Vote Solar continuously strives, whenever practical or possible, to narrow participation to areas where Vote Solar is more likely to bring a unique voice, perspective or contribution. Additionally, in the case of this rulemaking, the impacts of residential rate redesign on existing and potential residential NEM customers is central to Vote Solar's efforts to increase energy independence, decrease fossil fuel dependence, and foster economic development by bringing solar energy into the mainstream. At the time R.12-06-013 began, Kelly Foley was handling this matter as Vote Solar's only in-house attorney and the only employee dedicated full time to CPUC-related issues. (*Vote Solar is not seeking reimbursement for any of Ms. Foley's time spent on this proceeding.*) After Ms. Foley's departure, Vote Solar retained the law firm of Ellison, Schneider & Harris, located in Sacramento, to provide the legal expertise needed for the representation of Vote Solar's interests in this rulemaking. As the timesheets attached hereto indicate, attorney Ronald Liebert assisted Vote Solar in the initial stages of Phase 1 of the proceeding. Vote Solar is seeking intervenor compensation for Mr. Liebert. Mr. Liebert has extensive experience representing customer groups and interest groups at the CPUC and the cumulative hours Mr. Liebert spent on this matter, including workshops, hearings, and comments, is reasonable and necessary. The CPUC has established intervenor compensation rates for Mr. Liebert that is reflected in Part III, Section B of this form. At the start of Phase 2 of the proceeding (interim rate redesign for implementation in summer of 2014), attorney Chase Kappel assumed primary responsibility for representing Vote Solar in this rulemaking. (Vote Solar opposed the IOU's initial interim rate proposal in Phase 2, which was also rejected by the Commission at the prehearing conference for Phase 2. Because Vote Solar found the IOUs' revised interim rate proposals acceptable, Vote Solar was able to minimize its effort in this Phase.) Ms. Kappel continued to represent Vote Solar for Phase 1 after the IOUs filed their long-term rate design testimony in February 2014. Vote Solar is seeking intervenor compensation for Ms. Kappel. Ms. Kappel has a history of prior experience representing interest groups and other party interests in Commission proceedings. The cumulative hours Ms. Kappel spent to adequately cover the issues raised in this rulemaking, including a workshop, hearings, briefs and comments were reasonable and necessary. (See	Vote Solar did not operate efficiently in this proceeding. Vote Solar's use of 11 representatives resulted in higher-than necessary-and significantly excessive hours to prepare documents despite issuing joint comments with other parties. This is unreasonable, given the number of filings produced (11), and the work in developing the issues jointly with SEIA should have reduced Vote Solar's hours claim. This also demonstrates that Vote Solar failed to adequately coordinate on NEM/TOU and Inclining Block issues, resulting in significant duplication. Thus, we find that compensating 50% of Issues A, B, C, E, and G is reasonable (See II. B.d.) . Vote Solar's claimed hours for preparing filings by legal staff are also excessive. Vote Solar claims 38.2 hours for its nine page Reply Brief on 1/26/15. This is double what we deem reasonable and 19.45 hours should be disallowed. For its 5/11/15 Opening Comments on the PD, Vote Solar requests 51.4 hours, of which we grant 28.4 hours. For the 5/18/15 Reply Comments on the PD, its request of 14.9 hours for 4.5 pages should be reduced by 6.65 hours. In producing its 6/11/15 Comments on the

attached request for first time hourly rate for Ms. Kappel.) Vote Solar seeks intervenor compensation for hours claimed by Susannah Churchill, Vote Solar's West Coast Regional Director. Ms. Churchill provided input on Vote Solar's policy direction and ensured the positions taken in the proceeding were consistent with Vote Solar's purpose and mission. Ms. Churchill has extensive experience with the CPUC as a result of her experience as a Renewable Energy Policy Analyst at the CPUC and as a Regulatory Analyst within the CPUC's Energy Division. Ms. Churchill has participated in many CPUC proceedings on Vote Solar's behalf. In particular, Ms. Churchill has advocated on the part of residential solar customers in R.12-11-005, which addressed a transition period for the NEM program, and R.14-07-002, which is addressing a possible successor to NEM. (See attached request for first time hourly rate for Ms. Churchill.) Vote Solar also seeks intervenor compensation for services provided by experts at MRW & Associates, LLC ("MRW"). MRW principal William Monsen provided Vote Solar's expert testimony in this proceeding. Mr. Monsen has over three decades of experience in the areas of energy economics, regulatory and policy analysis, and electricity supply and transmission planning, and he has testified as an expert witness more than 75 times. Mr. Monsen was assisted by Laura Norin and other staff at MRW in assessing the IOUs rate proposals, developing expert testimony, and providing further review and insight for purposes of later briefing and comments in the proceeding. (See attached request for first time hourly rate for William Monsen and other MRW professionals.)	Alternate PD, it requests 42.8 hours for 12 pages, which is excessive by 21.1 hours. The request for preparing the compensation claim itself is also excessive: 139 hours for preparing the intervenor compensation claim (29 hours in 2014 and 110 hours in 2015). The hours requested for claim preparation is excessive. We allow 12.2 hours in 2014 and 21.8 hours in 2015. *See* discussion in Part b above and Part c below. Also, *see* III.D.8, CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments.
c. Allocation of hours by issue: See Attachment 2 for details **Issue A.** Whether PG&E's rate design proposals for its optional TOU rates will harm existing NEM customers or discourage future potential for investment in renewable distributed generation. **371.5 hours (29.87%)** **Issue B.** Whether SDG&E's rate design proposals for its optional TOU rates will harm existing NEM customers or discourage future potential for investment in renewable distributed generation. **118.65 hours (9.54%)** **Issue C.** Whether SCE's rate design proposals for its optional TOU rates will harm existing NEM customers or discourage future potential for investment in renewable distributed generation. **70.8 hours (5.69%)**	Vote Solar requests 905 hours for work on NEM and TOU rates: ▪ 561 hours on investigating whether the IOU TOU rate design proposals harm NEM customers (Issues A,B,C) ▪ 105.6 hours for work on the issue of a Phase 1 default TOU rate (Issue D) ▪ 223.15 hours on representing the contributions and impacts

Issue D. Whether Phase 1 of the proceeding should approve a move towards a default TOU rate, and, if so, what protections should be in place for customers on a default TOU rate? **105.6 hours (8.49%)** **Issue E.** Whether the Commission and the IOUs are adequately considering and representing the contributions and impacts of residential NEM customers. **223.15 hours (17.94%)** **Issue F.** What is the most appropriate and effective process for moving towards a properly tested and designed default TOU rate that will not result in customer shock? **15.7 hours (1.26%)** **Issue G.** Whether a more optimal inclining block rate structure has fewer tiers and a lower differential between rate tiers. **183.7 hours (14.77%)** **Issue H.** Whether the IOUs' proposals for inclining block rates that reduce the number of tiers and differentials in the rates for each tier are consistent with the Rate Design Principals, Commission policies, and state policies. Specifically, do the IOU's proposals for inclining block rates encourage conservation, energy efficiency, and economically efficient decision making? **68 hours (5.47%)** **Issue I.** Whether adoption of a fixed customer charge is consistent with the Rate Design Principals. Specifically, would a fixed customer charge encourage conservation, energy efficiency, or economically efficient decision making? **28.6 hours (2.3%)** **Issue J.** Whether imposition of a reasonable minimum bill amount is a preferred alternative to recover costs from extremely low-usage customers. **14.35 hours (1.15%)** **Issue K.** How should revenue collection shortfalls be treated between customer groups on different tariffs? **0.4 hours (0.03%)** **Issue L.** General and Procedural **43.35 hours (3.49%)**	of residential NEM customers (Issue E) ▪ 15.7 hours for work on a process for moving a default TOU rate (Issue F). Vote Solar also claims excessive hours in two categories for inclining block rates: ▪ 183.7 hours on investigating inclining block rate structure tiers and differentials (Issue G). ▪ 68 hours again on examining whether the IOUs' inclining block rate structures (Issue H). Vote Solar's allocation by issue shows duplication and excessive hours dedicated to Issues A-F, all relating to TOU rates impacts to NEM customers for each utility, and it also includes Category E as a "catch-all category" for NEM work. Issue allocation categories G and H also overlap, bringing the hours requested for Inclining Block rates to 251.7 hours.

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Total $**
Ronald	2013	122.7	$395	D.14-12-071	$48,466.50	85.1	$395	$33,614.50

Liebert				; D.15-06-026				
Ronald Liebert	2014	49	$405	D.14-12-071 ; D.15-06-026	$19,845.00	31.5	$405	$12,757.50
Ronald Liebert	2015	13.6	$425	See Part III.C., Comment [1], requesting step-up adjustment	$5,780.00	7.4	$425	$3,145.00
Chase Kappel	2013	31.8	$310	First-time rate request, Attachment 3	$9,858.00	19.9	$290	$5,771.00
Chase Kappel	2014	388.9	$320	First-time rate request, Attachment 3	$124,480.00	271	$300	$81,300.00
Chase Kappel	2015	202.9	$320	First-time rate request, Attachment 3	$64,928.00	114.55	$300	$34,365.00
William Monsen	2012	40.25	$325	First-time rate request, Attachment 5	$13,081.25	30.35	$325	$9,863.75
William Monsen	2013	53	$325	First-time rate request, Attachment 5	$17,225.00	34.5	$325	$11,212.50
William Monsen	2014	94.75	$325	First-time rate request, Attachment 5	$30,793.75	51.38	$325	$16,698.50
William Monsen	2015	23.5	$325	First-time rate request, Attachment 5	$7,637.50	13.25	$325	$4,306.25
David Horwarth	2013	6.75	$275	First-time rate request, Attachment 6	$1,856.25	3.375	$275	$928.13
Laura Norin	2013	7.25	$245	D.14-06-049 ; D.14-08-025	$1,776.25	5.125	$245	$1,255.63
Laura Norin	2014	76.5	$245	D.14-06-049	$18,742.50	40.88	$245	$10,015.60

				; D.14-08-025				
Laura Norin	2015	4.25	$245	D.14-06-049 ; D.14-08-025	$1,041.25	6.625	$245	$1,623.13
Briana Kobar	2013	7.25	$135	D.14-06-049	$978.75	4	$135	$540.00
Julia Getchell	2013	3.75	$155	First-time rate request, Attachment 7	$581.25	2.25	$~~140~~135 *See* D.16-10-013.	$~~348.75~~303.75
Brandon Charles	2013	2	$160	D.14-08-025	$320.00	1.5	$160	$240.00
Naina Gupta	2014	25.75	$126	First-time rate request, Attachment 8	$3,244.50	12.88	$~~126~~135 *See* D.16-10-013.	$~~1,622.88~~1,738.80
Susannah Churchill	2013	15.5	$240	First-time rate request, Attachment 4	$3,720.00	7.7	$~~225~~240 *See* D.16-05-047.	$~~1,732.50~~1,848.00
Susannah Churchill	2014	15.8	$240	First-time rate request, Attachment 4	$3,792.00	7.9	$~~230~~240	$~~1,817.00~~1,899.00
Susannah Churchill	2015	14.7	$240	First-time rate request, Attachment 4	$3,528.00	7.35	$~~230~~240	$~~1,690.50~~1,764.00
					***Subtotal:* $ 381,675.75**		***Subtotal:* $ ~~234,848.11~~233,226.12**	
OTHER FEES								
Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):								
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Hours**	**Rate**	**Total $**
Eric Janssen	2013	7.1	$100	D.14-12-071 ; D.15-06-026	$710.00	5.2	$100	$520.00
Eric Janssen	2014	12.6	$105	D.15-06-026	$1,323.00	8.6	$105	$903.00
Eric Janssen	2015	24.1	$105	D.15-06-026	$2,530.5	20.5	$105	$2,152.50
					***Subtotal:* $4,563.50**			***Subtotal:* $3,575.50**
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	**Year**	**Hour**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Hours**	**Rate**	**Total $**

		s						
Ronald Liebert	2014	1.6	$405	See Sec. III.B fees table, above	$648.00	1.6	$202.50	$324.00
Ronald Liebert	2015	1	$425	See Sec. III.B fees table, above	$425.00	1	$212.50	$202.50
Chase Kappel	2014	26.8	$320	See Sec. III.B fees table, above	$8,576.00	10	$150.00	$1,500.00
Chase Kappel	2015	98.2	$320	See Sec. III.B fees table, above	$33,280.00	10	$150.00	$1,500.00
Eric Janssen	2014	0.6	$105	See Sec. III.B fees table, above	$63.00	0.6	$52.50	$31.50
Eric Janssen	2015	6.3	$105	See Sec. III.B fees table, above	$661.50	6.3	$52.50	$330.75
Laura Norin	2015	4.5	$245	See Sec. III.B fees table, above	$1,102.50	4.5	$122.50	$551.25
					***Subtotal:* $44,756.00**	***Subtotal:***		***$4,440.00***
***Subtotal Divided by Half for I.Comp Time Recovery Rule:* $22,378.00**								

COSTS

#	Item	Detail	Amount	Amount
1	Photocopies	Costs associated with filing, service, and presentation of evidence at evidentiary hearings	$286.20	$286.20
2	Postage	Costs associated with complying with hardcopy service rules set for proceeding	$34.45	$34.45
3	Lexis Research	Costs associated with legal research for briefs and comments.	$259.65	$259.65
		TOTAL REQUEST:	**$409,197.55**	**TOTAL AWARD:** **$~~243,443.91~~243,785.84**

**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. 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 typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate .

ATTORNEY INFORMATION			
Attorney	**Date Admitted to CA BAR[4]**	**Member Number**	**Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?)** **If "Yes", attach explanation**
Ronald Liebert	12/11/1989	142964	No
Chase B. Kappel	1/2/2007	248023	No

C. ~~Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and~~Intervenor's Comments on Part III:

~~Attachment or~~ Comment #	~~Description/~~Intervenor's Comment(s)
~~1~~	~~Certificate of Service~~
~~2~~	~~Contemporaneous Time Sheets for Attorneys, Experts, Policy Director~~
~~3~~	~~First-time representative – rate request for Chase B. Kappel~~
~~4~~	~~First-time representative – rate request for Susannah Churchill~~
~~5~~	~~First-time representative – rate request for William A. Monsen~~
~~6~~	~~First-time representative – rate request for David Horwarth~~
~~7~~	~~First-time representative – rate request for Julia Getchell~~
~~8~~	~~First-time representative – rate request for Naina Gupta~~
~~9~~	~~Invoice or Receipt for Charges in Excess of $20.00 in Support of Direct Costs Claimed~~
Comment 1	**2015 Hourly Rate for Attorney Ronald Liebert:** For Mr. Liebert's work in 2015, Vote Solar seeks an hourly rate of $425. Mr. Liebert's 2014 hourly rate of $405 was approved in D.15-06-026. Vote Solar's request to increase Mr. Liebert's 2015 hourly rate by 5% is made pursuant to D.08-04-010 and D.07-01-009, which authorize two 5% step increases for practitioners in the 13+ years' experience tier. This request is for approval of the first of the two permitted 5% step increases.

D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:

Item	Reason
1. Ronald Liebert's Rate	Liebert 2014 rate, previously set by the Commission is $405. Vote Solar requests a 5% step increase to increase his rate to $425 in 2015. We apply the step increase and apply the 2015 hourly rate of $425.

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

2. Chase Kappel's Hourly Rate	Vote Solar requests an hourly rate of $310 for Kappel, as a first-time representative at the Commission. Kappel was admitted to the California Bar in January 2007, but has worked in energy regulatory matters since 2008. In 2013, Kappel's experience falls within the 5-7 year rate range of $290-310. We authorize an hourly rate of $290. We authorize a 2014 hourly rate of $300, after applying the 2.58% Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) for 2014 and rounding to the nearest $5. As there is no COLA in 2015, her 2015 rate is also $300.
3. William Monsen's Hourly Rate	We authorize Monsen's requested hourly rate of $325 within this proceeding for 2013, 2014, and 2015. The rate is reasonable given his experience of more than 35 years in energy consulting and work within the proceeding. The requested rate falls below the halfway mark of the rate range of $170-420 per hour in 2013, for experts with 13 years and more of experience.
4. David Horwath's Hourly Rate	We authorize Vote Solar's request for an hourly rate of $245 in 2013. As an expert with more than 13 years of experience, the requested rate falls within the experience rate range.
5. Julia Getchell's Hourly rate	Vote Solar requests a rate of $155 per hour for Getchell's work as an analyst on the proceeding. This is the first time she has appeared before the Commission, and Vote Solar's time sheets show she only worked 3.75 hours. We authorize a rate of $~~140, with an~~135, which is appropriate for Getchell's level of experience~~ range of 0-6 years of $140-200.~~.
6. Naina Gupta's Hourly Rate	Vote Solar requests an hourly rate of $126 for Gupta, an associate who conducted market research. We approve ~~the requested~~a rate~~, which is below the rate range of experts with 0-6 years of experience,~~ of $~~140-200~~135.
7. Susannah Churchill's Hourly Rate	Vote Solar requests an hourly rate of $240 in 2013 for Churchill, which is at the upper range of $165-$280 for experts with 7-12 years of experience. Churchill has 10 years of experience, as we do not include the two years of Churchill's time spent on her Master's degree thesis as full-time work experience. It is reasonable to set her rate at the mid-level of the rate range, $225, for 2013. For 2014, we apply the 2.58% COLA adjustment for a 2014 hourly rate of $230. As there is no COLA for 2015, Churchill's rate is also $230 for 2015.
8. Disallowances for Duplication	We find the claimed hours to be excessive given the number, size and complexity of filings produced by Vote Solar on its own and in collaboration with SEIA.

and Excessive Hours	Vote Solar requests for compensation for 1,244 hours. Those hours include Vote Solar's collaboration on five joint filings with SEIA, including a rate design proposal and comments. On its own, Vote Solar produced a PHC statement, opening and reply briefs, and three sets of comments on the PD and the APD. For its work on TOU rates and its impact on NEM Issues, Vote Solar requests 905 hours. Vote Solar requests 561 hours for its work on the impact of the IOUs' TOU rates to solar customers in Issues A, B, and C and then requests for another 223 hours for its advocacy of rate impacts to NEM customers in Issue E, which overlaps with the work described in Issues A, B, and C. Vote Solar also included a further 105.6 hours for TOU rates in Issue D, which considers the default TOU rate. The hours claimed for Issue G duplicate Issue H. The claim is unreasonable given the number of filings produced, and that the work in developing the issues jointly with SEIA and should have reduced Vote Solar's hours claim. This demonstrates that Vote Solar failed to adequately coordinate on the NEM/TOU and Inclining Block issues, resulting in duplicative efforts. We find that compensating 50% of Issues A, B, C, E, and G is reasonable (See III.a.c). Vote Solar's time claimed for preparing filings were excessive and should also be reduced. We make the following additional adjustments to the hours claimed on filings: <u>2015</u>: 1/5/15 Opening Brief – Vote Solar requests 92.6 hours for preparing the 27 page brief, of which we accept 49.15 hours as reasonable: 3.8 hours (Liebert), 4.3 hours (Janssen), 41.05 hours (Kappel). 1/26/15 Brief – Vote Solar requests 38.2 hours for the nine page brief, which we reduce 19.45 hours as excessive. The revised hours are: 2.35 hours (Liebert), .55 hours (Janssen), 15.85 hours (Kappel). 5/11/15 Comments on the PD – Vote Solar requests 51.4 hours, of which we grant 28.4 hours: .7 hour (Liebert), 21.8 hours (Kappel), and 5.05 hours (Janssen). 5/18/15 Reply Comments to the PD – We compensate Vote Solar for 8.25 hours: .45 hours (Liebert), 1.65 hours (Janssen), 6.15 hours (Kappel). 6/11/15 Comments on the Alternate Decision – We reduce 21.7 hours from the 42.8 hours requested by Vote Solar as excessive. We compensate the following: .15 hours (Liebert), 2.65 hours (Janssen), 18.9 hours (Kappel). We reduce Churchill's hours for 2013, 2014, and 2015 by 50% due

	to internal duplication. While her role was to manage the case and ensure consistency with Vote Solar's purpose and mission, this work duplicated that of the attorneys. The attorneys also performed case management, and requested significant hours for coordination and case management.
9. Reduction of excessive hours to prepare compensation claim	Vote Solar requests a total of 139 hours for preparing the intervenor compensation claim (29 hours in 2014 and 110 hours in 2015). We allow 12.2 hours in 2014 and 21.8 hours in 2015. *See* III.A.b. We also correct Vote Solar's Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation Rates in III.B. to reflect the half-hourly rate for Vote Solar staff for claim preparation. Pursuant to Decision 98-04-059, the Commission has deemed appropriate for compensating time to prepare intervenor compensation claim requests at one-half the rate of the advocate/attorney's normal hourly rate.

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.~~

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

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Vote Solar has made a substantial contribution to D.15-07-001.

2. The requested hourly rates for Vote Solar'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, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.

4. The total of reasonable compensation is $~~243,443.91.~~243,785.84.

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 shall be awarded $~~243,443.91~~ 243,785.84.

2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, the Pacific Gas and Electric Company, the San Diego Gas and Electric Company, and the Southern California Edison Company shall pay Vote Solar their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2015 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. 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 November 14, 2015, the 75th 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

Compensation Decision:		**Modifies Decision?**	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D.15-07-001		
Proceeding(s):	R.12-06-013		
Author:	McKinney		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison.		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Vote Solar	8/31/15	$409,197.55	$~~243,443.91~~ 243,785.84	N/A	Disallowances for Duplicative Work and Excessive Hours; Hourly Rates

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Ronald	Liebert	Attorney	Vote Solar	$395	2013	$395
Ronald	Liebert	Attorney	Vote Solar	$405	2014	$405
Ronald	Liebert	Attorney	Vote Solar	$425	2015	$425
Chase	Kappel	Attorney	Vote Solar	$310	2013	$290
Chase	Kappel	Attorney	Vote Solar	$320	2014	$300
Chase	Kappel	Attorney	Vote Solar	$320	2015	$300
William	Monsen	Expert	Vote Solar	$325	2012	$325
William	Monsen	Expert	Vote Solar	$325	2013	$325
William	Monsen	Expert	Vote Solar	$325	2014	$325
William	Monsen	Expert	Vote Solar	$325	2015	$325
David	Horwarth	Expert	Vote Solar	$275	2013	$275

Laura	Norin	Expert	Vote Solar	$245	2013	$245
Laura	Norin	Expert	Vote Solar	$245	2014	$245
Laura	Norin	Expert	Vote Solar	$245	2015	$245
Briana	Kobar	Expert	Vote Solar	$135	2013	$135
Julia	Getchell	Advocate	Vote Solar	$155	2013	$~~140~~135
Brandon	Charles	Expert	Vote Solar	$160	2013	$160
Naina	Gupta	Advocate	Vote Solar	$126	2014	$~~126~~135
Susannah	Churchill	Expert	Vote Solar	$240	2013	$~~225~~240
Susannah	Churchill	Expert	Vote Solar	$240	2014	$~~230~~240
Susannah	Churchill	Expert	Vote Solar	$240	2015	$~~230~~240
Eric	Janssen	Paralegal	Vote Solar	$100	2013	$100
Eric	Janssen	Paralegal	Vote Solar	$105	2014	$105
Eric	Janssen	Paralegal	Vote Solar	$105	2015	$105

(END OF APPENDIX)

Document comparison by Workshare Compare on Monday, October 17, 2016 1:27:55 PM

Input:	
Document 1 ID	file://d:\ek4\Desktop\R1206013 McKinney Vote Solar Comment Dec 9-13-16.docx
Description	R1206013 McKinney Vote Solar Comment Dec 9-13-16
Document 2 ID	file://d:\ek4\Desktop\R1206013 McKinney Agenda Dec. (Rev. 1) Granting Compensation to Vote Solar 10-17-16.docx
Description	R1206013 McKinney Agenda Dec. (Rev. 1) Granting Compensation to Vote Solar 10-17-16
Rendering set	Standard

Legend:	
Insertion	
~~Deletion~~	
~~Moved from~~	
Moved to	
Style change	
Format change	
~~Moved deletion~~	
Inserted cell	
Deleted cell	
Moved cell	
Split/Merged cell	
Padding cell	

Statistics:	
	Count
Insertions	51
Deletions	51
Moved from	0
Moved to	0
Style change	0
Format changed	0
Total changes	102