Docket Number:	16-OIR-03
Project Title:	Energy Data Collection
TN #:	214536
Document Title:	Claire Warshaw Comments: Collecting Customer Data from Utilities_Personal Opinion
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Claire Warshaw
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	11/21/2016 2:00:32 PM
Docketed Date:	11/21/2016

Comment Received From: Claire Warshaw Submitted On: 11/21/2016 Docket Number: 16-0IR-03

Collecting Customer Data from Utilities_Personal Opinion

I attended the morning session of this meeting. I am a former employee of SMUD as some are aware. I was afraid of what I might have said if I commented at this meeting because this particular subject I find somewhat potentially mentally assaulting.

I am sensitive to the idea of data collection because as the person who represented San Diego's utility mentioned in the morning section, data even without names can seem to somehow get into hands of people who are not necessarily acting in the customer's best interest. Hacking seems prevalent with our youth. I am not certain who/what hacks and if for certain that my privacy invasions are the result of hacking, but it has become apparent that perhaps one might know when I have left my home and/or listened to things I have said inside the so-called "privacy" of my home. Obviously though if data is collected every 15 minutes one might be able to tell if someone is home or not. The idea that someone might identify someone by 'triangulating' and/or I might add by simply practicing trying to predict a customers' behavior, I find realistic to think about. Predicting a customer for some of us is not as nice as some might assume. I do not think we all want to be "corralled" by our past and/or current behaviors.

Recent examples of what I have perceived as problems due to data collection of some sort:

Example One: I came home last week to a package of herbs in my cabinet, which look like pot that had no twist tie or identifier on them. I did express online that I voted for proposition 64 so perhaps someone thought this was appropriate. Likely the herbs were ones that I owned already but someone sort of sabotaged them making them unidentifiable. I have not been a pot smoker, but understand the need to regulate this crop. Still this was a bit alarming to find.

Example two: I mentioned to my sister on my cell phone that I planned to bring green beans to Thanksgiving (if I get there) and opened my recipe cabinet to find a green bean recipe with fennel that I had made for a prior Thanksgiving right in front of me.

Example Three: I have been somewhat harassed on the street leaving my home by random strangers on bicycles riding the wrong direction on sidewalks often on a street - Mayhew Road South of Micron - with clear large bicycle lanes.

Example Four: While walking I have had several cars not stop when I have the walk sign right away and turn right towards me. This $\hat{a} \in \alpha$ came to a head $\hat{a} \in \beta$ last week, Tuesday Evening when I purposely walked into a vehicle without speeding up my walking to do so. Three police cars passed me earlier in the day when I walked to the post office; during that time nobody harassed me. It has happened so often that when that change occurred for a brief period of time I thought maybe things had changed.

There has to be something more to these examples than what "meets the eye". I am not sure what it is. Perhaps it is my cell phone. Perhaps it is all visual/word of mouth and people recognize me by my glasses for example. When I read about such advanced science such as $\hat{a} \in \alpha ANN \hat{a} \in (artificial neural network)$ I might be at a loss for guessing how this happens. I do suspect more than one factor is to blame. Even though none of it has been actually physical it does not feel good to experience. I cannot say it is a great thing to $\hat{a} \in \alpha ext{get}$ use to $\hat{a} \in \ldots$. These are examples of what I suspect to a data collector and/or hacker assume is $\hat{a} \in \alpha harmless \hat{a} \in \ldots$. This are what I presume many youth want in terms of transparency. I suspect there are very few hackers/data collectors and then somehow there is

a host of bad people that somehow get access to the hacker/data collector's data. I think people want to punish others with their opinions and data. I think even when there is hardly anything to punish someone with, because there is this lack of privacy somehow, the people that want to punish will continue to do so. This is somewhat silencing to people and a form of oppression.

I did speak to SMUD people after the morning session and expressed my endorsement of some of the San Diego utility person's comments. What I disagree on is the idea that data is in great hands necessarily as it currently is. I do not see it as being especially protected from hackers even in the best locations. A person inside an agency who disfavors someone can make that person extremely uncomfortable having access to data. I had this experience. I had my computer monitors go down when a project was due for example and IT people telling me they would be there to fix it not showing up. I do think that for example at SMUD one is not protected necessarily at all unless the people in IT want to protect the employee. In fact I see data collection potentially as something that can work completely oppositely of every good intention.

More data collection is not something I would naturally endorse anywhere. If there were a way of keeping people from not being competitive and hurting other people by wandering into their data = old or new, perhaps it might be a good idea.

Saying all that, and having worked for a utility, I do not think that the CEC is trying to create harm by trying to comply with recent legislation on data collection. I hope they are trying to make the energy improvements "good" and keep the making of "good" as their focus. I think the utilities ought to hand over existing data collection that they already intake. In that way the CEC could see what the utilities deal with now and determine what data they ought not to collect perhaps as part of this direction. If the CEC wants different data then I think the CEC might have to fund that new collection somehow. If a"good" focus could be maintained than I see these more data collection. I do not want to endorse that invading one's privacy to make a better customer experience is working, because for me it absolutely opened the door to being vulnerable to hatred for not doing as those that analyzed data on me want me to do and/or me not accepting what they think is their "gift" to me or their opinions on what is right to do. Trashing bad, irrelevant and/or outdated data is a good practice. So I hope there is some rules about how trashing of data can become easy and acceptable.

I did listen to the new CEC representative's presentation about the potential for better device regulation. That is a crucial good idea in my beliefs. I do think she is on the right track. I am not sure how we all can get into the same frame of mind keeping the data clean, succinct in itself, and for angelic purposes. I am not sure how to suggest doing this. It seems that one can create an enormous amount of data, keep the hackers and the CEC employees so busy trying to read it all that they become confused and discouraged OR one can make clean clear amounts of data and get everyone more focused. I suggest asking for the least amount of new data as possible "for starters" even though there is a clear need to want it all. Getting started by receiving what data is/has been already generated seems like it ought to be easy for utilities. The utility privacy needs are likely the similar to those of the CEC. Perhaps CEC lawyers could assist in re-writing any utility company privacy customer paperwork so that there is data to work with and so that CEC data needs could more be expedited.

I am not sure I heard these words correctly but it seemed the speakers referred to "dogs", $\hat{a} \in \alpha$ love $\hat{a} \in$, and a $\hat{a} \in \alpha$ guinea pig $\hat{a} \in$. Forgive me if I heard those words incorrectly. These talks have been interesting to listen to at times. I will be glad that you all are discussing the pertinent energy data collection issues in more depth and let go of the additional attachment topics. Collecting extraneous non-Energy related data is something I do consider harmful. This unfortunate extraneous data collection does seem to happen though whether the angelic data collectors want it to happen or not. People might sell or share extraneous data to better those they want in power. People can be targeted badly. I feel as though I am that $\hat{a} \in \alpha$ guinea pig $\hat{a} \in$ example. I point out the need of more caution in wanting more customer data collection as a necessity. It makes sense to me if the CEC and all its stakeholders could more

agree on what is needed and make a plan to shed all the ways to collect any unwelcome data types.