

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Authority to Increase Revenue Requirements to Recover the Costs to Upgrade its SmartMeter™ Program. (U39E)

Application 07-12-009  
(Filed December 12, 2007))

**PREHEARING CONFERENCE STATEMENT OF THE TECHNOLOGY  
NETWORK (“TECHNET”)**

In accordance with Rule 7.2 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure and the procedural schedule set forth in the August 6, 2010 *Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling Setting Prehearing Conference* (“ALJ Ruling”), The Technology Network (“TechNet”)<sup>1</sup> hereby submits this prehearing conference (“PHC”) statement. The ALJ Ruling sets a PHC in this proceeding for Wednesday, August 18, 2010, and requests that parties address several questions in PHC statements to be filed by no later than August 16, 2010. TechNet’s responses to the questions set forth in the ALJ Ruling are as follows:

**1. Do available facts support the immediate suspension of PG&E’s program of installing SmartMeters™?**

No. Indeed, all available *facts* support the continued deployment of PG&E’s program. At the Commission’s direction, PG&E has released an unprecedented amount

---

<sup>1</sup> TechNet is the bipartisan, political network of CEOs and Senior Executives that promotes the growth of technology and the innovation economy. TechNet focuses on politics and policy by bringing its members together with our nation’s policy makers to sustain and advance America’s global leadership in innovation. In addition to its offices in Washington, DC and Silicon Valley, TechNet has a presence in New England; Texas; the Pacific Northwest; Sacramento, CA; and Albany, NY. TechNet’s members represent two million employees in the fields of information technology, clean technology, biotechnology, e-commerce and finance.

of operational data regarding the performance of the SmartMeter™ program, the clear import of which is that the SmartMeter™ program is working as intended, delivers improved accuracy in meter reading compared to prior technologies, and is experiencing very few issues relative to the complexity and size of the project. Neither the City and County of San Francisco (“CCSF”) nor any of the other parties that have joined CCSF’s petition have made any compelling, fact-based argument for a delay in the program, instead wholly relying on a combination of opinion, conjecture and third-hand anecdotal evidence in support of their claims.

Any delay in the deployment of PG&E’s SmartMeter™ program would increase the costs of the program to ratepayers and would delay the availability of SmartMeter™ benefits to all of PG&E’s customers. Delaying such a massive program will not only cause ratepayers to incur stand-down and start-up expenses, but may also cause uncertainty in the availability of supply from PG&E’s vendors. Additionally, consumers will experience delays in both operational benefit realization and potential energy cost savings as it would become difficult to implement new, incentive rate structures until all customers have been enabled with SmartMeters. The best way to benefit consumers is to ensure that they have prompt access to products and services that will enable them to use energy usage information provided by their SmartMeters.

Finally, results from the Commission’s third-party investigation are expected to be made available very shortly. Similar investigations in Texas (albeit with some variance in the specific technologies deployed) have validated the efficacy of smart metering technologies, as have various interim testing, side-by-side meter comparisons and utility acceptance testing. Although no technology rollout of this scale is perfect,





**SERVICE LIST - A.07-12-009**

BKallo@rwbaird.com  
CCassman@abc-law.com  
CJGF@pge.com  
CManson@SempraUtilities.com  
DNG6@pge.com  
Dana. Mcrae@co.santa-cruz.ca.us  
JBarisone@abc-law.com  
KAF4@pge.com  
LDRi@pge.com  
RPrince@SempraUtilities.com  
SWFS@pge.com  
ag2@cpuc.ca.gov  
agc@cpuc.ca.gov  
austin.yang@sfgov.org  
bfinkelstein@turn.org  
bkc7@pge.com  
bschuman@pacific-crest.com  
bsk@cpuc.ca.gov  
case.admin@sce.com  
cem@newsdata.com  
Chris@emeter.com  
cjb@cpuc.ca.gov  
cjn3@pge.com  
cjh5@pge.com  
crv@cpuc.ca.gov  
ctd@cpuc.ca.gov  
dbyers@landuselaw.com  
ehw2@pge.com  
ericd@silverspringnet.com  
janet.combs@sce.com  
jeff.francetic@landisgyr.com  
jmrb@pge.com  
joc@cpuc.ca.gov  
julien.dumoulin-smith@ubs.com  
karpiak@rwglaw.com  
kkm@cpuc.ca.gov  
kpowell@loganpowell.com  
kpp@cpuc.ca.gov  
Iwt@cpuc.ca.gov  
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com  
mjd@cpuc.ca.gov  
mrw@mrwassoc.com  
nsuetake@turn.org  
pfa@cpuc.ca.gov  
pforkin@daystartech.com  
regrelcpuccases@pge.com  
rhd@cpuc.ca.gov  
rmason@rwbaird.com  
rogerl47@aol.com  
rrh3@pge.com  
rschmidt@bartlewells.com  
sandi@emfsafetynetwork.org  
service@spurr.org;  
srovetti@sfgov.org  
tburke@sfgov.org  
to@cpuc.ca.gov  
theresa.mueller@sfgov.org  
wharrison@rwbaird.com  
william.sanders@sfgov.org  
wtr@cpuc.ca.gov  
zango@zimmerlucas.com  
sawn@pge.com  
scl@cpuc.ca.gov

