

**Victory in Sedona!**  
**Information & Perspective by Warren Woodward**  
**Sedona, Arizona ~ April 12, 2017**

At an April 11, 2017 Sedona City Council meeting, Council voted unanimously to send a letter to the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) recommending against *all* of the major "smart" meter related proposals in the APS rate case Settlement Agreement.

By the way, "Settlement Agreement" does not mean done deal; the rate case has more steps to go. Settlement Agreement means that a number of Intervenor in the case have agreed to certain terms and conditions in the rate case and will not be hashing those out in hearings. As an Intervenor in the rate case, I do not support the Settlement Agreement. My testimony against the Settlement Agreement is here: <http://docket.images.azcc.gov/0000178628.pdf>

Council's letter to the ACC takes a stand against the Settlement Agreement proposals that solar and commercial customers not be able to refuse a "smart" meter, that APS be allowed get rid of analog meters altogether and immediately, and that APS be allowed to charge a \$5 fee -- or fee *of any amount* -- to customers who refuse "smart" meters.

Although Council's vote was unanimous, the letter was not without some contention while being discussed at the meeting. Both Mayor Moriarty and Vice Mayor Martinez were in favor of charging a fee to customers who refuse "smart" meters. Despite being corrected by their peers, both of them mistakenly insisted that, because they had "smart" meters, they did not have a meter reading fee on their APS bill. The fee is on *all* APS customers' bills, "smart" meters or not.

Vice Mayor Martinez asserted that customers who refused "smart" meters were getting a "free lunch" if they did not pay to have someone read their meter. By that statement it was clear that Vice Mayor Martinez had either not read the information I'd sent him several times or, if he had read it, did not understand it. So during public comment I repeated that, based on APS's own numbers, it was costing APS more than \$8.8M to "save" \$4.75M per year given a 20 year "smart" meter life, or more than \$28M to "save" \$4.75M per year given a more realistic 6 year "smart" meter life. I pointed out that customers who refused "smart" meters had the cheaper meter reading system therefore, and so were actually subsidizing "smart" meter customers like him.

A local news report on the Council meeting mentioned Vice Mayor Martinez's "free lunch" comment but neglected to report my response. Persons reading the false news report might then assume that the Vice Mayor's comment was accurate. It was not.

Neither Mayor Moriarty nor Vice Mayor Martinez were dissuaded by facts, however, and both voted against a no fee stipulation in the letter to the ACC. Thankfully, the rest of Council voted for no fee, and in the end both the Mayor and Vice Mayor voted for the final draft of the letter which included the stance against charging a fee.

Thank you to everyone who wrote and phoned Council, and a special thank you to those who spoke before Council. It would have been awfully disappointing to have Council advocating against the very people on whose behalf Council intervened in the rate case in the first place.