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Pursuant to Rule 13.8 of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Rules of Practice and Procedure, I submit this rebuttal testimony on behalf of the EMF Safety Network (Network) in response to The Utility Reform Network (TURN), prepared testimony of Jeffrey A. Nahigian submitted on October 5, 2012. While I appreciate TURN’s efforts to lower costs overall, TURN’s recommendation to charge SCE customers even more than the current “interim” fees is a contradiction to TURN’s advocacy and public position on Smart Meters.

TURN historically has encouraged utility customers to refuse Smart Meters on their homes. Below are two screen shots of signs TURN circulated encouraging customers to post in order to refuse Smart Meters.¹²

TURN encouraged not only customers, but whole neighborhoods to boycott Smart Meters: In May 2010, TURN posted a link on Facebook directing customers to start Smart Meter free zones. The KTVU news article, East Bay Neighborhood Fights PG&E Smart Meters reports³, “The Utility Reform Network was there to celebrate the residents decision to boycott PG&E digital devices...PG&E is out of touch, and out of control,” said Mark Toney with The

¹ http://salsa.democracyinaction.org/o/746/p/salsa/web/common/public/signup?signup_page_KEY=5221
² http://blog.sfgate.com/scavenger/2010/05/20/oakland-neighborhoods-smart-meter-insurrection/
Utility Reform Network.”

In an email blast\(^4\) (date uncertain) TURN directed its members to send a message to the CPUC with the subject line: **I demand a choice about smart meters.** The email stated the current charges were unaffordable for many:

“\textit{Dear Commissioners,}

I want a choice about whether or not to have a smart meter installed in my home. For that choice to be meaningful, it must be affordable.

The charges currently authorized by the CPUC will make opting out unaffordable for many. Surely there is a better- and fairer- way. Utility companies that insisted on installing the meters over customer objections, and are making huge profits on them, must provide affordable options and the choice that they should have offered in the first place.

I support TURN’s demands for an affordable opt-out, either allowing customers to read their own meters or some other method that gives customers a real choice. Customers have already been charged close to $5 billion for these unwanted and untrustworthy meters.

\(^{4}\text{http://salsa.democracyinaction.org/o/746/p/dia/action/public/?action_KEY=6613}\)
Smart meters are anything but smart from my perspective. Concerns including the accuracy of the meters, security of the data they transmit and potential health impacts have not been resolved. You’ve already said customers should have a choice. Please make sure that choice is meaningful by making sure it is affordable.”

In May of 2012, TURN posted the following article which says it will “demand proof that there is not a more affordable way to provide an opt out...” and continues to encourage customers to refuse Smart Meters stating, “Contact your utility company and let it know that you don’t want a smart meter”.

On December 12, 2011 in TURN’s Comments on Proposed Decision (PD) in A.11-03-014 (p.14-16) TURN explains how the conclusion of the PD to reject shareholder responsibility is wrong and asserts PG&E shareholders should pay at least 50% of opt out program costs.

TURN comments include the following:

- “… it is documented that customer dissatisfaction was greatly exacerbated by PG&E’s failure to respond adequately to customer calls and complaints. PG&E stonewalled customers, maintained that the meters were 100% accurate, failed to address underlying concerns and failed to process complaints in a timely manner.”

- “PG&E’s response contributed to media attention and customer dissatisfaction.”

- “TURN thus suggests that at least 50% of the net costs of the opt-out program should be
TURN’s prepared testimony of Jeffrey Nahigian recommends Smart Meter opt out customers should pay even more than the current “interim opt out fees” of $75/10 and $10/5 for low income customers. TURN sided with SCE and SDG&E in recommending individual customers who refuse Smart Meters pay all opt out program costs stating: “Turn supports Edison and Sempra Utilities’ proposals to recover SOP costs in SOP charges.” TURN recommends SCE customers pay $56 initial fee and $19 every month, and low income customers should pay $45 initial fee and $15 a month. (Testimony of Jeffrey A. Nahigian p.25) That’s $80 more per year, and $145 more per year for low income customers than the current CPUC proposed “interim” fees.

TURN encouraged customers to boycott Smart Meters, formally stated shareholders should pay 50% of the costs, but now they want individuals to pay all opt out costs. Why has TURN contradicted itself and turned against its own mission to hold utility corporations accountable by demanding fair rates, and strong consumer protections?

In a recent email regarding a phone conversation with TURN, a man reported the following, “Just called TURN and talked to a guy (Jeff?) who said TURN was advocating for $0 opt out fee and $0 monthly fees.” I directed him to call TURN back, which he did, and he followed up by stating, “Anna Gonzales from the TURN consumer hotline just now returned my call regarding opt out fees – and she said that from the beginning, TURN has advocated $0 fees for both opt out and monthly fees. She said TURN’s position is that PGE shareholders should bear that burden.”

Without a formal public explanation for the discrepancy between TURN’s public position and its testimony, the Commission should be skeptical of TURN’s testimony pertaining to allocation of all opt-out costs to individuals.

This completes the rebuttal testimony of Sandi Maurer.
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