

**From:** [Curt Rehberg](#)  
**To:** [IPA.Solar](#)  
**Subject:** [External] Althoff Industries, Inc.-Stakeholder Feedback on CP initiatives  
**Date:** Friday, September 27, 2024 9:14:32 AM

---

Dear Illinois Shines:

Really impressive approach on all three Consumer Protection Initiatives. After reading through, we had only a couple comments/questions, they are as follows:

-  
**Comment on Approved Vendor Cap and Claim Prioritization:** The approach allowing customer claims to be paid on a prorated basis seems the most fair. Especially in light of the fact that the Agency is permitting a reasonable time period within which to file claims after the claim period is opened. However, we believe that there should be some clarification on the proration issue when the Agency-approved claims submitted exceed the amount in the AV Cap. Is the proration based upon the number of claimants or value of each claim as compared to the total value of claims against that AV? It appears that the intent is that it's based upon the value of each claim as compared to the total value of claims against the AV, but some claimants might believe that it is prorated equally among each claimant.

**General comment on when in process AV adder is approved.** Will the internal list of stranded customers be further classified as a Low, Medium, High or Very High classification so that a new proposed Approved Vendor is able to calculate the level of incentive before accepting the assignment or will the Approved Vendor be responsible for evaluating the level of risk based upon a published table?

Curt Rehberg  
Althoff Industries, Inc.  
8001 S. Route 31  
Crystal Lake, IL 60014

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]