

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 89184 AUG 8 - 1978

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

GEORGE O. B. BRYANT AND GRATIS )  
BRYANT, )

Complainants, )

vs. )

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON CO., )

Defendant. )

(ECP)

Case No. 10558  
(Filed May 2, 1978)

George O. B. Bryant and Gratis  
Bryant, for themselves,  
complainants.  
D. E. Sparks and Bill Thomas,  
for defendant.

OPINION AND ORDER

This is an Expedited Complaint Procedure pursuant to Rule 13.2 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure and Section 1702.1 of the Public Utilities Code. A public hearing was held before Administrative Law Judge Wright in Los Angeles on June 27, 1978 and the matter was submitted. Complainants testified on their own behalf. Testimony on behalf of defendant was presented by Bill Thomas, defendant's service representative.

Complainants have lived, with one child, at their home in Inglewood since January 19, 1975, during which time their bills for electricity have increased from approximately \$50 bimonthly to \$90 bimonthly. They complain that they cannot understand the reason for the continuing high bills and seek reevaluation of their account for the last year and credit reimbursement, if due.

The evidence shows that the major amount of increase occurred after the installation of a heating unit in January 1976. Upon the advent of this increase, complainants notified defendant and complained on several later occasions. The meter at complainants' premises was tested twice, the last test being made on February 24, 1978, and both tests proved the meter to be accurate. Additionally, defendant presented a tabulation showing that the electric appliances on complainants' premises were capable of using energy in excess of the highest use registered for any period of complainants' residency.

While complainants assert with all sincerity that they are trying to conserve energy and that their bills should be getting lower rather than higher, the evidence is clear that the meter at complainants' premises functions properly and was correctly read. In these circumstances, we are ~~compelled to~~ <sup>WAA</sup> conclude that the high use complained of must in fact have occurred. It is the duty of defendant to charge and collect for all energy used as provided in the tariffs.

At the hearing, it was agreed that defendant's service representative would again visit complainants at their home to review with them the several energy conservation techniques that may be available to lower usage, such as placing the water heater thermostat at a lower setting. Additionally, it was agreed that, following a new trial period, defendant would replace the meter if complainants so requested.

IT IS ORDERED that the relief requested is denied and the sum of \$117.11, and any other sums deposited with the Commission by complainants with respect to this complaint, be remitted to defendant to be credited to complainants' account.

The effective date of this order shall be thirty days after the date hereof.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 8th day of AUGUST, 1978.

Robert Bateman  
President

Vernon L. Stinson  
Charles D. Gable

Commissioners

Commissioner William Symons, Jr., being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

Commissioner Claire E. Dedrick, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.