

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



February 2, 2015

Ms. Lorraine A. Kocen
State Government Affairs
Verizon Wireless
2535 W. Hillcrest Drive
Newbury, CA 91320

CA2014-011

SUBJECT: Audit of Verizon Wireless – Orange County

Dear Ms. Kocen:

On behalf of the Electric Safety and Reliability Branch of the California Public Utilities Commission, Koko Tomassian of my staff conducted a Communication Infrastructure Provider (CIP) audit of Verizon Wireless – Orange County from November 17 to November 21, 2014. The audit included a review of Verizon Wireless' records and field inspections of Verizon Wireless' facilities.

During the audit, my staff identified violations of one or more General Orders (GOs). A copy of the audit findings itemizing the violations is enclosed. Please advise me no later than March 2, 2015, by electronic or hard copy, of all corrective measures taken by Verizon Wireless 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 black ink, appearing to read "Fadi Daye".

Fadi Daye, P.E.
Program and Project Supervisor
Electric Safety and Reliability Branch
Safety and Enforcement Division

Enclosure: Audit Findings

CC: Elizaveta Malashenko, Deputy Director, Safety and Enforcement Division, CPUC
Charlotte TerKeurst, Program Manager, Electric Safety and Reliability Branch, CPUC

AUDIT FINDINGS

The following violations were not documented and/or addressed by Verizon Wireless during its last detailed inspection as required by General Order 95:

1.	Structure No.:	NT709-H7-02
	Previous Verizon Wireless Visit Details:	May 23, 2014
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	November 18, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Unracked Underground Cables</u>		
<p>GO 128, Rule 17.1, Design, Construction, and Maintenance, States in part:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Electrical supply and communication systems shall be designed, constructed, and maintained for their intended use, regard being given to the conditions under which they are to be operated, to enable the furnishing of safe, proper, and adequate service.</i></p> <p>The handhole structure housed underground cables which were not racked.</p>		

2.	Structure No.:	4755285E
	Previous Verizon Wireless Visit Details:	May 23, 2014
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	November 18, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Damaged Guy Guard</u>		
<p>GO 95, Rule 86.9 Guy Marker (Guy Guard), States in part:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>A substantial marker of suitable material, including but not limited to metal or plastic, not less than 8 feet in length, shall be securely attached to all anchor guys.</i></p> <p>The pole supported a down guy wire which was not guarded with a substantial marker of suitable material.</p>		

3.	Structure No.:	1031930H
	Previous Verizon Wireless Visit Details:	May 23, 2014
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	November 18, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Damaged Visibility Strip</u>		
GO 95, Rule 31.1, Design, Construction and Maintenance, States in part:		
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Electrical supply and communication systems shall be designed, constructed, and maintained for their intended use, regard being given to the conditions under which they are to be operated, to enable the furnishing of safe, proper, and adequate service.</i></p>		
The pole had a damaged visibility strip.		

4.	Structure No.:	4326902E
	Previous Verizon Wireless Visit Details:	May 29, 2014
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	November 18, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Communication Cables not Marked</u>		
GO 95, Rule 91.5, Marking, States in part:		
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Each communication cable and conductor as defined by Rules 20.4, 20.6(A), 20.9, 84.1, 87.4(C), and 89.1 that is attached to a joint-use pole shall be marked as to ownership... This marking requirement applies only to (A) new construction, (B) reconstruction of facilities, and (C) existing aerial communication cables and conductors that a technician works on when the technician ascends the joint-use pole for regular maintenance.</i></p>		
The Verizon Wireless cables attached to this pole were not marked to indicate ownership.		

5.	Location:	4326907E
	Previous Verizon Wireless Visit Details:	May 29, 2014
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	November 18, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<p data-bbox="167 591 505 625"><u>Broken Down Guy Wire</u></p> <p data-bbox="167 666 1198 702">GO 95, Rule 86.2, Overhead Guys, Anchor Guys and Span Wires, States in part:</p> <p data-bbox="293 742 1300 853"><i>Guys shall be attached to structures, as nearly as practicable, at the center of load. They shall be maintained taut, and of such strength as to meet the safety factors of Rule 44.</i></p> <p data-bbox="167 895 659 929">The pole had a broken down guy wire.</p>		

6.	Structure No.:	4326905E
Previous Verizon Wireless Visit Details:		May 29, 2014
Date of CPUC Inspection:		November 18, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<p data-bbox="175 621 402 653"><u>Loose Guy Wire</u></p> <p data-bbox="175 688 1206 720">GO 95, Rule 86.2, Overhead Guys, Anchor Guys and Span Wires, States in part:</p> <p data-bbox="305 768 1308 873"><i>Guys shall be attached to structures, as nearly as practicable, at the center of load. They shall be maintained taut, and of such strength as to meet the safety factors of Rule 44.</i></p> <p data-bbox="175 919 646 951">The pole had a slack down guy wire.</p> <p data-bbox="175 999 646 1031"><u>Down Guy Wire Not Sectionalized</u></p> <p data-bbox="175 1066 898 1098">GO 95, Rule 86.6-B2, Guys in Proximity, States in part:</p> <p data-bbox="305 1146 1357 1325"><i>Every overhead or anchor guy, any portion of which is in proximity to a wood pole and supply conductors of 0 – 33,500 volts (see Appendix G, Figures 45, 48, and 49) shall be sectionalized by means of insulators as specified in Rule 86.7-A2 or Rule 86.7-B, and no portion in proximity to such supply conductors shall be grounded...</i></p> <p data-bbox="175 1371 1198 1402">The down guy wire in proximity to supply conductors was missing an insulator.</p>		

7.	Structure No.:	4319056E
	Previous Verizon Wireless Visit Details:	May 29, 2014
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	November 18, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership</u>		
GO 95, Rule 84.4-C, Clearances Between Conductors, requires a minimum 12 inch vertical separation between communication cables of different ownership.		
The vertical clearance between a Verizon Wireless cable and other CIP cable(s) were less than 12 inches at midspan.		

8.	Structure No.:	4319102E
	Previous Verizon Wireless Visit Details:	May 29, 2014
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	November 18, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership</u>		
GO 95, Rule 84.4-C, Clearances Between Conductors, requires a minimum 12 inch vertical separation between communication cables of different ownership.		
The vertical clearance between a Verizon Wireless cable and other CIP cable(s) were less than 12 inches at midspan.		

9.	Structure No.:	4327419E
	Previous Verizon Wireless Visit Details:	May 29, 2014
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	November 18, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership</u>		
GO 95, Rule 84.4-C, Clearances Between Conductors, requires a minimum 12 inch vertical separation between communication cables of different ownership.		
The vertical clearance between a Verizon Wireless slack loop and other CIP cable(s) were less than 12 inches.		

10.	Structure No.:	4327418E
	Previous Verizon Wireless Visit Details:	May 29, 2014
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	November 18, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership</u>		
GO 95, Rule 84.4-C, Clearances Between Conductors, requires a minimum 12 inch vertical separation between communication cables of different ownership.		
The vertical clearance between a Verizon Wireless cable and other CIP cable(s) were less than 12 inches at midspan. Additionally, the Verizon Wireless slack loop at this pole was in contact with CIP cable(s) of different ownership.		
<u>Missing Guy Guard</u>		
GO 95, Rule 86.9, Guy Marker (Guy Guard), States in part:		
<i>A substantial marker of suitable material, including but not limited to metal or plastic, not less than 8 feet in length, shall be securely attached to all anchor guys...</i>		
The pole supported a down guy wire which was not guarded with a substantial marker of suitable material.		

11.	Structure No.:	1614457E
	Previous Verizon Wireless Visit Details:	August 14, 2014
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	November 19, 2014
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.		

12.	Structure No.:	1614455E
	Previous Verizon Wireless Visit Details:	August 14, 2014
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	November 19, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Third Party Safety Hazard – Broken Lashing Wire</u>		
GO 95, Rule 18-B, Notification of Safety Hazards, States:		
<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>		
A lashing wire of another CIP was broken. Verizon Wireless did not notify the CIP of this safety hazard when it last visited the pole.		

13.	Structure No.:	1478116E
	Previous Verizon Wireless Visit Details:	July 31, 2014
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	November 19, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Broken Lashing Wire</u>		
GO 95, Rule 31.1, Design, Construction and Maintenance, States in part:		
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Electrical supply and communication systems shall be designed, constructed, and maintained for their intended use, regard being given to the conditions under which they are to be operated, to enable the furnishing of safe, proper, and adequate service.</i></p>		
The pole had a broken lashing wire.		

14.	Structure No.:	1478119E
	Previous Verizon Wireless Visit Details:	July 31, 2014
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	November 19, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Broken Lashing Wire</u>		
GO 95, Rule 31.1, Design, Construction and Maintenance, States in part:		
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Electrical supply and communication systems shall be designed, constructed, and maintained for their intended use, regard being given to the conditions under which they are to be operated, to enable the furnishing of safe, proper, and adequate service.</i></p>		
The pole had a broken lashing wire.		

15.	Structure No.:	1478120E
	Previous Verizon Wireless Visit Details:	August 1, 2013
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	November 19, 2014
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.		

16.	Structure No.:	P128426
	Previous Verizon Wireless Visit Details:	June 20, 2014
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	November 20, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership</u> GO 95, Rule 84.4-C, Clearances Between Conductors, requires a minimum 12 inch vertical separation between communication cables of different ownership. The vertical clearance between a Verizon Wireless cable and other CIP cable(s) were less than 12 inches at midspan.		

17.	Structure No.:	1027563H
	Previous Verizon Wireless Visit Details:	June 20, 2014
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	November 20, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<p data-bbox="185 587 1271 619"><u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership</u></p> <p data-bbox="185 661 1357 736">GO 95, Rule 84.4-C, Clearances Between Conductors, requires a minimum 12 inch vertical separation between communication cables of different ownership.</p> <p data-bbox="185 774 1433 849">The vertical clearance between a Verizon Wireless cable and other CIP cable(s) were less than 12 inches at midspan.</p>		