
From: David Waterhouse [djwaterhouse@shaw.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 11:48 AM
To: Commission Secretary BCUC:EX
Subject: Smart Meter Fraud

Good day Commission Secretary,

I wish to provide my input on the "smart meter," opt out costs. In so doing I also direct my comments to Mr. Greg Reimer. First, let me provide you with a short overview of what is taking place in Victoria, Australia:

Stop Smart Meters Australia

Double dipping

By Janobai Smith, Fryerstown
Nov. 25, 2013, 2 p.m.

The government has signaled its intentions to charge consumers refusing smart meters extra for the privilege of retaining their existing meter. Industry sources predict this will be \$120 to \$150 per annum. Isn't this double dipping? We all have been paying for smart meters since the beginning of 2010, whether or not we have one. The Auditor-General's 2009 report slammed Victoria's smart meter rollout. Nothing much has changed. Why should consumers be punished for the government's (past and present) and the power distributors' poor decisions? We were never consulted. In the meantime, thanks to the special status which Victoria's privatized power distributors enjoy, it's the customer who always pays.

Greg Reimer, \$35 per month is \$420 per annum. It seems Australia has a tad bit more respect for their hydro customers than you folks do. \$120 per annum is one heck of a difference, wouldn't you agree?

Greg, correct me if I'm wrong, but you have already purposefully hired a company at an inflated cost to read the meters monthly. Right? What will Hydro's cut of those profits be? This too would be fraud on your part to artificially prove that the costs you state for meter reading are in fact justified. We both know they are not. I'm hoping the Commission will also realize this and recommend an official enquiry take place. I do hope a thorough investigation takes place to show you can't break laws just because you are a monopoly. Fraud is still fraud. Your customers are ashamed of Hydro's antics.

I'd like to thank the Commission for their consideration. My stated information is not intended as malice, merely a statement of facts. The public needs to be protected from those who would bring harm to them.

Sincerely yours,

David Waterhouse