

Penalty fee for using an analogue meter

Letter of objection from Susan Foster

April 30, 2012

RE: "Penalty Fee" Assessed by SDG&E

Dear CPUC Commissioners and Judge Amy Yip Kikugawa:

I am an SDG&E customer writing in opposition to the \$75.00 fee I must pay to SDG&E to keep my analogue meter that was never removed when smart meters were originally installed in my neighborhood in Rancho Santa Fe, CA. I wrote to SDG&E prior to installation, advising them of my medical condition along with a letter from my cardiologist, as well as a scientific study linking RF radiation to cardiac arrhythmia. SDG&E eventually decided to label my home as a "bypass", and therefore I have retained my original analogue meters.

When I called SDG&E on April 24 to ask why I needed to pay \$75 since there would be no actual work done at my home because I had retained the original meters, I was informed that for me the \$75 was a "penalty fee." I was surprised at this terminology, as I read Judge Amy Yip Kikugawa's rulings with respect to the opt-out, and I do not see where a "penalty fee" is to be assessed. I thought we had the freedom to choose whether or not to accept a smart meter. Nowhere in the Administrative Law Judge's ruling do I see justification for penalizing a customer with a medical condition for opting to bypass a meter that would cause harm to my health *when that customer requires no work to be done on her property.*

In fact, it is my understanding that I have already paid SDG&E through increased fees for installation of smart meters I never had installed, as well as through my Federal tax dollars for stimulus funds that have funded this smart meter program, at least in part. Where is the logic in a penalty fee under such circumstances?

I asked the SDG&E employee who said I was being assessed a "penalty fee" to check and see if she was using the right terminology with me. After a short time on hold, she returned to the phone to tell me her original statement was correct.

Could you please explain SDG&E's justification for assessing a "penalty fee" when I am simply asking to protect my health, which I have every right to do.

Thank you for your prompt reply, as I must respond via certified letter before June 15, 2012.

Respectfully Yours,

Susan Foster

SUSAN FOSTER, MSW
Rancho Santa Fe, CA