

From: Brown, Carol A.  
Sent: 12/16/2010 4:57:30 PM  
To: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7);  
Clanon, Paul (paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov)  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: RE: SmartMeter Option

Thanks for thinking "outside-the-box" If it works for you - I think it has possibilities - and just might help avoid claims under the Americans with Disabilities Act (not that RF sensitivity counts) but it still could pose a legal challenge that would have you spinning your wheels fighting that!

Happy to chat with you anytime!

**From:** Cherry, Brian K [mailto:BKC7@pge.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 16, 2010 3:18 PM  
**To:** Clanon, Paul;  
Brown, Carol A.  
**Subject:** SmartMeter Option

We have coalesced around an option to resolve the RF issue that I wanted to surface for you. We would propose that those people claiming RF illness would need to get to a doctor and we would have a Commission established protocol for that (like medical lifeline). We would then turn off the RF signal on the meter off but leave the meter in place to record the data. Once a year, we would read the meter. We could read it manually or we could turn the meter on once and download the data (not sure which we would propose). We would charge people selecting this option some nominal meter reading fixed fee (ex. \$100). In addition, anyone selecting this tariff would be required to be placed upon the Balanced Pay Plan, which takes their previous yearly load (gas; electric or both) and divides it by 12. Once a year, we would true up their usage costs against their payments. The nice idea about this approach is that it offers a solution at a relatively low cost of implementation, it would use existing BPP tariffs and we could continue to roll-out SmartMeter installation. Thoughts ? If you like the idea, please share those thoughts with Mike. We might be able to file something in mid-late January, depending on the vehicle you think we should use.