

From: michael.hoover@sce.com
Sent: 1/6/2012 1:02:29 PM
To: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7)
Cc: 'marzia.zafar@cpuc.ca.gov' (marzia.zafar@cpuc.ca.gov)
Bcc:
Subject: RE: smart meter

We need an up front fee that is significant, or a path to achieve that. This is especially true for CARE customers. This is a big deal for us and I think the potential for significant increases in opt out is rather large if the fee is set too low. Are we all on the same page?

Michael R. Hoover
Director, Regulatory Affairs
(415) 929 - 5541
San Francisco Office

From: "Cherry, Brian K" <BKC7@pge.com>
To: "marzia.zafar@cpuc.ca.gov" <marzia.zafar@cpuc.ca.gov>
Cc: "Michael.Hoover@sce.com" <Michael.Hoover@sce.com>
Date: 01/06/2012 10:16 AM
Subject: Re: smart meter

Marzia - I agree it has the potential to increase the opt out slightly, which is why I would oppose Mike decreasing the monthly fee again.

From: Zafar, Marzia [<mailto:marzia.zafar@cpuc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Friday, January 06, 2012 09:39 AM
To: Cherry, Brian K
Cc: Michael.Hoover@sce.com <Michael.Hoover@sce.com>
Subject: smart meter

Hi Brian,

I mentioned your idea - which I don't agree with – to Edison's Mike Hoover. You guys should talk.

I think if there is not an initial fee your estimate of 2% opt out goes out the door and you'll have more like 20% or 50% opt out which will then make the whole project that we spent over \$7 billion on a complete and total waste. Remember, the goal of this opt-out program is to be reasonable and give an option at a reasonable cost while continuing with California's energy policy goals of more RPS, more net-metering, more solar, and more upgrades on the grid.

Talk to each other, please.

Marzia Zafar * CPUC * zaf@cpuc.ca.gov * 415-703-1997