

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



July 10, 2013

Kristin Jacobson
Regulatory Attorney
Sprint Nextel
201 Mission Street, Suite 1500
San Francisco, California 94105

CA2013-004

SUBJECT: Audit of Sprint Nextel – LA County Market

Dear Ms. Jacobson:

On behalf of the Electric Safety and Reliability Branch of the California Public Utilities Commission, Koko Tomassian, Zelalem Ewnetu, and Yusef Collins of my staff conducted an audit of Sprint Nextel – LA County Market from April 29, 2013 to May 3, 2013. The audit included a review of Sprint's records and field inspections of Sprint's facilities.

During the audit, my staff identified violations of one or more General Orders (GOs). A copy of the audit summary itemizing the violations is enclosed. Please advise me no later than August 23, 2013, by electronic or hard copy, of all corrective measures taken by Sprint to remedy and prevent such violations.

If you have any questions, you can contact Koko Tomassian at (213) 576-7099 or koko.tomassian@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Raymond Fugere".

Raymond Fugere, P.E.
Program and Project Supervisor
Electric Safety and Reliability Branch
Safety and Enforcement Division

Enclosure: Audit Summary

CC: Fadi Daye, Senior Utilities Engineer Supervisor, CPUC

AUDIT SUMMARY

1.	Location:	LA County
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	April 29, 2013
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Inspection & Maintenance Program Deficiencies</u>		
<p>GO 95, Rule 18A-2, Resolution of Safety Hazards and General Order 95 Nonconformances, states in part:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The auditable maintenance program shall prioritize corrective actions consistent with the priority levels set forth below...</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>There shall be 3 priority levels.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(i) Level 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ... • <i>Take action immediately, either by fully repairing the condition, or by temporarily repairing and reclassifying the condition to a lower priority.</i> <p>Upon review of Sprint's current inspection and maintenance program, we discovered that Level 1 GO 95 nonconformances were remedied within 30 days and not immediately, as required by GO 95.</p>		

2.	Structure No.:	371671M
	Previous Sprint Visit Details:	Patrol Inspection, October 30, 2012
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	April 30, 2013
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<p><u>Exposed Ground Wire – 3rd Party</u> GO 95, Rule 84.6-B, Ground Wires, states in part:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Ground wires, other than lightning protection wires not attached to equipment or ground wires on grounded structures, shall be covered by metal pipe or suitable covering of wood or metal, or of plastic conduit material as specified in Rule 22.8-A, for a distance above ground sufficient to protect against mechanical injury, but in no case shall such distance be less than 7 feet...</i></p> <p>GO 95, Rule 18-B, Notification of Safety Hazards, States:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“If a company, while performing inspections of its facilities, discovers a safety hazard(s) on or near a communications facility or electric facility involving another company, the inspecting company shall notify the other company and/or facility owner of such safety hazard(s) no later than 10 business days after the discovery.”</i></p> <p>The ground molding, belonging to Cable TV, on the pole was broken/damaged resulting in insufficient covering of the ground wire at a distance of 7 feet or less from the ground. Sprint did not notify the Cable TV company of this safety hazard when it last visited the pole.</p>		

3.	Structure No.:	72931M
	Previous Sprint Visit Details:	Detail Inspection, October 11, 2012
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	April 30, 2013
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Low Pole Step</u>		
GO 95, Rule 91.3-B, Location of Steps, states in part:		
<i>The lowest step shall be not less than 7 feet 6 inches from the ground line...</i>		
The lowest pole step on the pole did not have sufficient clearance from the ground line.		

4.	Structure No.:	23288M
	Previous Sprint Visit Details:	Patrol Inspection, October 30, 2012
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	April 30, 2013
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership</u>		
GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 8C, requires that:		
<i>Conductors and/or cables, on separate crossarms or other supports at different levels on the same pole must maintain a 12 inch vertical separation from communication conductors.</i>		
The vertical clearance between a Sprint cable and other CIP cables at midspan was less than 12 inches.		

5.	Structure No.:	23290M
	Previous Sprint Visit Details:	Patrol Inspection, October 30, 2012
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	April 30, 2013
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership</u>		
GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 8C, requires that:		
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Conductors and/or cables, on separate crossarms or other supports at different levels on the same pole must maintain a 12 inch vertical separation from communication conductors.</i></p>		
The vertical clearance between a Sprint cable and other CIP cables at midspan was less than 12 inches.		

6.	Location:	23291M
	Previous Bright House Visit Details:	Detail Inspection, October 30, 2012
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	April 30, 2013
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership</u>		
GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 8C, requires that:		
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Conductors and/or cables, on separate crossarms or other supports at different levels on the same pole must maintain a 12 inch vertical separation from communication conductors.</i></p>		
The vertical clearance between a Sprint cable and other CIP cables at the pole was less than 12 inches.		

7.	Structure No.:	23293M
	Previous Sprint Visit Details:	Patrol Inspection, October 30, 2012
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	April 30, 2013
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<p><u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership</u></p> <p>GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 8C, requires that:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Conductors and/or cables, on separate crossarms or other supports at different levels on the same pole must maintain a 12 inch vertical separation from communication conductors.</i></p> <p>The vertical clearance between a Sprint cable and other CIP cables at midspan was less than 12 inches.</p>		

Area of Concern

During the audit we discovered that vegetation was causing strain on Sprint facilities at Pole # 72940M. Please let us know what mitigating actions Sprint has taken to remedy this issue.