

**From:** [cindy.alia](mailto:cindy.alia)  
**To:** "Scott Shock"; [UTC DL Records Center](mailto:UTC DL Records Center)  
**Cc:** [capr-admin@lists.celestial.com](mailto:capr-admin@lists.celestial.com)  
**Subject:** RE: [Capr-admin] Comments on WUTC Docket No. U-180117 regarding smart meters Opt-In / Opt-out policies  
**Date:** Thursday, March 15, 2018 10:54:59 AM

---

Scott,  
Thank you for this excellent set of response comments!  
Cindy Alia

---

**From:** Capr-admin <[capr-admin-bounces+cindy=capr.us@lists.celestial.com](mailto:capr-admin-bounces+cindy=capr.us@lists.celestial.com)> **On Behalf Of** Scott Shock  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 15, 2018 12:26 AM  
**To:** [records@utc.wa.gov](mailto:records@utc.wa.gov)  
**Cc:** [capr-admin@lists.celestial.com](mailto:capr-admin@lists.celestial.com)  
**Subject:** [Capr-admin] Comments on WUTC Docket No. U-180117 regarding smart meters Opt-In / Opt-out policies

Received  
Records Management  
03/15/18 11:17  
State Of WASH.  
UTIL. AND TRANSP.  
COMMISSION

Dear WUT Commissioners,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the questions in Docket No. U-180117. Please accept the following requests and input.

- A. **Please add the following to the Interested Parties list:**
  - a. Citizens' Alliance for Property Rights (CAPR), [www.capr.us](http://www.capr.us), 718 Griffin Avenue #7, Enumclaw, WA 98022, [info@proprights.org](mailto:info@proprights.org), 206-335-2512
  - b. Scott Shock, 337 24<sup>th</sup> Ave E, Seattle, WA 98112, [ssshock@comcast.net](mailto:ssshock@comcast.net), 206-650-3421 (Member and President of CAPR)
- B. **Please note that CAPR members are concerned about trespass, privacy and security, safety, health, costs, and other issues associated with so-called "smart" meters or "advanced metering infrastructure", and that we are prepared to hold members of the commission commercially liable, AS INDIVIDUALS, for any and all 'smart' meter installations.**
- C. **With respect to the questions posed in the docket in regard to "Commission Policy on Customer Choice for Smart Meter Installation", we offer the following preliminary input:**
  - 1. Should companies be required to offer customers the choice to opt-out of smart meter installation at their premises? Alternatively, should customers affirmatively opt-in? ***Customers should be able to opt in, without dealing with the extortive and unequally-applied bureaucracy of "opt-out".***
  - 2. Should companies be required to offer all customer classes the choice to opt-out or opt-in for smart meter installation? ***Yes! Opt-in should be the default option.***
  - 3. What company estimates, if any, have already been developed for how many customers would choose to opt-out or opt-in for smart meter installation? ***When informed about the risks and relative lack of benefits, we anticipate that a large***

*number of informed customers would choose not to opt-in (or would opt-out).*

4. What challenges do the companies face based on different levels of opt-in and opt-out (e.g., 1 percent, 5 percent, 25 percent) and what smart grid benefits are either reduced or eliminated at these levels?

*If the WUTC commissioners/staff actually perform due diligence on "Advanced" Metering/"smart" utility meters, they will find many issues, risks, and liabilities, and few benefits for customers. Wired options may be in development that have much lower risk/liability.*

5. For those customers who select to opt-out of, or decline to opt-in to, smart meter installation, what types of services or benefits would they be forgoing?

*Customers would forego limited "benefits" and would forego many risks/harms by declining to opt-in, or by opting-out.*

6. What types of costs are associated with offering an analog/existing meter opt-out option?

*On the one hand, limited costs for human meter readers or self-reported readings, and on the other hand, by avoiding the flawed "smart" meter technology, prevention of large costs for installing, maintaining, security, and periodic replacement (more frequently than analog meters) for so-called "smart" meters, as well as avoidance of corporate and individual liability resulting from litigation or other commercial liabilities for trespass, privacy and security, safety, health, financial and other harms caused to customers. Utilities are required to account for Asset Retirement Obligations and other liabilities under Generally Accepted Accounting Principals (GAAP).*

7. Are costs a function of the number of customers choosing to opt-in or opt-out?

*Yes, but perhaps not in the way anticipated, when all risks and liabilities are factored in. See response to Question No. 6.*

8. Should all costs associated with the opt-out choice be paid by the individual customer making that election or should some portion of those costs be allocated to all ratepayers and/or to company shareholders?

*There should be opt-in only, without any protection racket-type extortion of exorbitant fees, which may in any case be illegal under state law regarding utility metering.*

9. What fees (one-time/recurring) should be assessed to customers who elect to opt-out and should the fees be assessed on a per-meter or per-location basis?

**See response to Question No. 8**

10. If a monthly fee component is included, should there be a limited duration for companies to recover the incremental costs associated with the customer's choice to retain an analog/existing meter?

**See response to Question No. 8**

11. If a one-time or up-front fee is required, should the companies be required to offer a payment plan?

**See response to Question No. 8**

12. If recurring opt-out fees are assessed with each meter reading, should alternative meter reading schedules be adopted to reduce the opt-out fees paid by the customer (e.g., bi-monthly, quarterly, or annually with budget billing)?

**See response to Question No. 8**

13. Should fees differ based on whether the customer is selecting to opt-out of a smart meter for a single service (e.g., electric or natural gas) or both services?

**See response to Question No. 8**

14. Should there be a fee imposed on customers who elect to opt-out and later desire to have a smart meter installed?

**No, that is simply a form of coercion.**

15. Should opt-out fees be a separate line item on a customer's bill?

**See response to Question No. 8**

16. Should more than one opt-out option be offered to customers who do not wish to have a wireless smart meter (e.g., a digital non-communicating meter)? If so, should the cost differ based on the type of meter selected?

**See response to Question No. 8**

17. Should customers with smart meters be offered the opportunity to relocate the smart meter to another location on their premises? If so, should the customer pay the cost of relocation?

**Yes, at no additional cost; also see response to Question No. 8**

18. What form(s) of communication should the companies employ to advise customers of their smart meter installation options, and what type of information should be communicated?

***Such information should be included in customers' monthly bills and prominently displayed on utilities' websites, with notices/press releases sent to local media. It should include all local/state government hearings/forums concerning this issue, with adequate time for public comment. 1-2 minutes is not time enough, although 3 may be. These forums should be scheduled during the early evening when people can attend them, and should be held at venues having adequate parking.***

Scott Shock  
President  
Citizens' Alliance for Property Rights  
[www.capr.us](http://www.capr.us)  
[sshock@comcast.net](mailto:sshock@comcast.net)  
206-650-3421

*"The Right of property is the guardian of every other Right, and to deprive the people of this, is in fact to deprive them of their Liberty."*

--Arthur Lee



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)