



BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FILED

05-04-12

04:59 PM

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for approval of Modifications to its SmartMeter™ Program and Increased Revenue Requirements to Recover the Costs of the Modifications (U39M).	Application 11-03-014 (Filed March 24, 2011)
Application of Utility Consumers' Action Network for Modification of Decision 07-04-043 so as to Not Force Residential Customers to Use Smart Meters.	Application 11-03-015 (Filed March 24, 2011)
Application of Consumers Power Alliance, Public Citizen, Coalition of Energy Users, Eagle Forum of California, Neighborhood Defense League of California, Santa Barbara Tea Party, Concerned Citizens of La Quinta, Citizens Review Association, Palm Springs Patriots Coalition Desert Valley Tea Party, Menifee Tea Party-Hemet Tea Party–Temecula Tea Party, Rove Enterprises, Inc., Schooner Enterprises, Inc., Eagle Forum of San Diego, Southern Californians For Wired Solutions To Smart Meters, and Burbank Action For Modification of D.08-09-039 and A Commission Order Requiring Southern California Edison Company (U338E) To File An Application For Approval of A Smart Meter Opt-Out Plan.	Application 11-07-020 (Filed July 26, 2011)

NOTICE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION

Pursuant to Rule 8.3 of the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, Center for Electrosmog Prevention (CEP) hereby gives notice of an ex parte communication sent by e-mail and reproduced below. The e-mail was sent on May 1, 2012, at 12:49 pm to the administrative law judge assigned to the above captioned proceeding and to the following e-mail addresses:

ayk@cpuc.ca.gov

martinhomec@gmail.com

jspirit@sonic.net

Problems with SDG&E Opt-Out Plan in Practice

From:

SBRINCHMAN@aol.com

May 1,
2012 at
12:49
pm

to ayk, me, jspirit

Dear Judge Yip-Kikugawa,

I would like to let you know that SDG&E has some problems implementing your order, thus far. Several of these problems are:

1. Setting up a telephone line that customers are asked to call and not answering the phone promptly. How many people man that phone - one? How many are calling to order smart meter opt-outs?
2. Calling the general SDG&E number (available to the general public) yields the caller denials about any SDG&E opt-out program, according to two of our members.
3. Charging people a fee who have an analog already and calling it a "penalty fee".
4. Forcing customers who want the opt-out to agree to an unspecified contractual agreement that sounds like a blank check for SDG&E.
5. Sending out a letter to everyone who has a smart meter or analog, on the "extended delay list" that informs them they must signup by June 15th, 2012, when in actual point of your ruling, those with smart meters do not need to do so by then, the enrollment is continuous. How many of these letters were sent out? Another notice needs to be sent that is corrected, for those with smart meters, informing them there is no deadline.

I am receiving complaints related to the above and also have experienced these myself, except for #2, which was documented by Susan Foster, a SDG&E customer who is one of our members.

I look forward to your timely assistance in the above important matter.

I will have this communication to filed as an ex parte.

Sincerely,

Susan Brinchman
Director, Center for Electrosmog Prevention
P.O. Box 655
La Mesa, CA
91944

director@electrosmogprevention.org

www.electrosmogprevention.org

Dated: May 3, 2012

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Martin Homec

MARTIN HOME C
Attorney for Center for Electrosmog
Prevention
P. O. Box 4471
Davis, CA 95617
Tel.: (530) 867-1850
Fax: (530) 686-3968
E-mail: martinhomec@gmail.com