

E. 01345A-11-0224

ORIGINAL



0000128492

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

RECEIVED

Investigator: Trish Meeter

Phone:

2011 AUG 22 P 44

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2011 97657

Date: 8/8/2011

Complaint Description: 01H Billing - Smart Meter
N/A Not Applicable

Complaint By: First: Greg Last: Billi

Account Name: Home:
Street: n/a Work:
City: n/a CBR:
State: AZ Zip: n/a is: E-Mail

Utility Company: Arizona Public Service Company

Division: Electric

Contact Name: For assignment

Contact Phone

Nature of Complaint:

DOCKET NO. E-01345A-11-0224

SMART METERS OPINION

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

AUG 22 2011

From: Greg Billi [mailto:
Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2011 1:29 PM
To: Steve Pierce
Subject: Smart Meters What Are Our Lawmakers Doing About Them

DOCKETED BY

Hi Mr. Steve Pierce,

I and my neighbors have a few concerns about the Smart Meters that APS is installing into peoples homes. I am contacting my state representatives because our Utilities have been subsidized and regulated by our state and therefore our state representatives are ultimately responsible for what is or is not allowed. My concerns are stated below, here are a couple links.

<http://www.smartmoney.com/spend/for-the-home/smart-meters-raise-privacy-concerns/>

<http://www.bobtuskin.com/2011/06/30/smart-meters-privacy-issues-radiation-electronic-pollution-and-more/>

I have also contacted The Arizona Corporation Commission and am waiting for a response, but again I consider my representatives part of the equation in what APS can or can not do.

My and my neighbors concerns are:

- 1. Do I have a choice. Can APS turn off power for refusing the smart meter.

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

(If they can do so, why are our representatives and regulatory agencies allowing this to be done with the level of privacy concerns via the level of extremely invasive data tracking that has not been addressed.)

2. Can they now charge us more money for the Smart Meter?

Already they have said the cost will not decrease and I have read that the cost of utilities has increased with the smart meter by charging for the meter equipment and servicing.

(Note: these are not saving money by not having the meters physically checked. On the APS site , they say the

Will I still be charged for a meter read fee on my bill once a smart meter is installed?

The meter read fee will still be charged on your bill to cover costs associated with retrieving your usage data. Even though a meter reader will not physically visit the property monthly there are still costs associated with the technology that is required to read the meter.

So these are not saving us money, the meters and technology is expensive and we are simply paying more for it.

3. What guarantees do we have of the data that these meters actually collect. The information shows extreme detailed activity usage in a home. Just because they are supposed to keep it safe or have data protection protocols doesn't make it okay to collect the data to begin with. As an elected representative in office to protect are rights and privacies, are you supporting unlimited tracking of home data by the smart meter because it is simply new technology. Do you support the fact that our rights to privacy end with new technology and private corporations (especially ones links with government support such as APS)?

In Conclusion:

I know there are many issues facing us today, but like the airport scanners in Arizona which our state legislature has allowed, which they can easily control with states rights and a standing for individual freedoms, I am totally losing any faith or confidence at all that our conservative representatives at local, state and federal levels are doing anything different from the other party. I don't know if my feelings are being felt by many other voters on a large scale or not, but I think that many people are rethinking who they are voting for. It sure seems that the current 2 party system is operating as one in reality (who is protecting our individual liberties?).

Regards,
Grea Billi - District 1

End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

docketed.

End of Comments

Date Completed: 8/8/2011

Opinion No. 2011 - 97657

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Richard Martinez

Phone:

Fax:

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2011 - 97655

Date: 8/8/2011

Complaint Description: 08A Rate Case Items - Opposed
19K Decoupling - Gas & Electric

First:

Last:

Complaint By: Jim Worthington

Account Name: Jim Worthington

Home:

Street:

Work:

City: Camp Verdr

CBR:

State: AZ Zip: 86322

is:

Utility Company: Arizona Public Service Company

Division: Electric

Contact Name: For assignment

Contact Phone:

Nature of Complaint:

Docket No. E01345A-11-0224

Why is the Commission even considering the current APS request for a new fee which they call a "decoupling" mechanism? Regardless of what they call it, it is a guaranteed income request. They no more deserve a guaranteed income than the lowest paid person in the labor market. You would refuse to even request back up information or discuss the request. A.P.S. has already demonstrated over the years they cannot properly run their business.

They couldn't run their nuclear power plant safely. They had, to bring in someone after many years of problems, who at least knew how to run the units. They also knew how to navigate the Nuclear Power Agencies rules and regulation.

They preached conservation, then when people conserved electricity they said they were loosing money because of it and, asked for rate increase. Give me a break! An indication of their ineptness is the fact that P.P. & L in Penza and other power plants tried to use that excuse 30-40 years ago. That gives you an idea of how far A.P.S. is behind in their thinking.

Take a real long hard look at their charges for Electricity Services. Take a real hard look & study it. It is conglomeration of ridiculous B.S and is a disgrace that a corporation would even publish it. One more indication of a corporate putting out some very high sounding information which does absolutely nothing to inform. A.P.S. is a classic example of that very old phrase "If you can't convince them of your integrity and know how, dazzle them with your B.S. ". The person who writes their billing services has to be a science fiction writer and probably the same person who writes the request and prepares information for the rate increases to ACC. They want a guaranteed income? Are you kidding me? No one, repeat no one in the U.S.

A. deserves or should receive a guaranteed income, especially a Corporation. They should be told no! They should go our and earn it live everyone else.

If A.P.S. cannot run, their business at a profit then I suggest the ACC find a Utility that can and tell APS to take a hike.

Sincerely,

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Jim Worthington

Campe Verde, AZ 85522
End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

8/08
Emailed to Phoenix for docketing.
FILE CLOSED.
End of Comments

Date Completed: 8/8/2011

Opinion No. 2011 - 97655

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Trish Meeter

Phone:

Fax:

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2011 97671

Date: 8/8/2011

Complaint Description: 08A Rate Case Items - Opposed
N/A Not Applicable

Complaint By: First: William Last: Gray

Account Name:

Home: 520 2855

Street:

Work:

City: Yuma

CBR:

State: AZ Zip: 85365

is:

Utility Company: Arizona Public Service Company

Division: Electric

Contact Name: For assignment

Contact Phone:

Nature of Complaint:

8/8
RATES OPPOSED to rates DOCKET NO. E-01345A-11-0224

Customer also believes the other charges on his bill are unwarranted. He believes it is subterfuge on the part of the company to breakdown the charges into all these pieces.

End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

DOCKETED
Advised caller his comments would be place on file in the pending rate application.
End of Comments

Date Completed: 8/8/2011

Opinion No. 2011 - 97671
