

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



June 3, 2013

Melvin Stark
Manager, Maintenance & Inspection
Southern California Edison (SCE)
3 Innovation Way
Pomona, CA 91768

EA2013-002

SUBJECT: Audit of SCE's Barstow District

Dear Mr. Stark:

On behalf of the Electric Safety and Reliability Branch of the California Public Utilities Commission, Derek Fong, Richard Kyo, and Zelalem Ewnetu of my staff conducted an audit of SCE's Barstow District from February 25, 2013 to March 1, 2013. The audit included a review of SCE's records and field inspections of SCE's facilities.

During the audit, my staff identified violations of one or more General Orders. A copy of the audit summary itemizing the violations is enclosed. Please advise me no later than July 12, 2013 by electronic or hard copy, of all corrective measures taken by SCE to remedy and prevent such violations.

If you have any questions, you can contact Derek Fong at (213) 576-6850 or derek.fong@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

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

Raymond G. Fugere, P.E.
Program & Project Supervisor
Electric and Communication Facility Safety Section
Safety and Enforcement Division

Enclosure: Audit Summary

AUDIT SUMMARY

1.	Location:	Barstow District
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	02/25/2013 – 3/1/2013
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Late Work Orders</u>		
<p>GO 165, Section IV, Standards for Inspection, Record-keeping, and Reporting, states in part:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">For all inspections, within a reasonable period, company records shall specify the circuit, area, or equipment inspected, the name of the inspector, the date of the inspection, and any problems identified during each inspection, as well as the scheduled date of corrective action.</p> <p>SCE records indicate that from 2010 to 2013, 55 work orders were completed late. Additionally, in 2013, there were 220 open/past due work orders.</p>		

The following violations were not documented and/or addressed by SCE during its last detailed inspection as required by General Order 165:

2.	Location:	Pole No. 4176741E
	Previous SCE Visit Details:	10/23/2012
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	02/25/2013
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Third Party GO 95 Nonconformance Not Reported</u>		
<p>GO 95, Rule 84.7, Climbing Space, states in part:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Climbing space shall be provided on one side or quadrant of all poles or structures...</i></p> <p>The pole had a communication cable wrapped around it, obstructing climbing space. SCE did not notify the communication company of the obstruction.</p>		

3.	Location:	Pole No. 1929162E
	Previous SCE Visit Details:	09/13/2012
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	02/26/2013
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Guy Wires Touching</u>		
<p>GO 95, Rule 56.4-D2, Passing and Attached to the Same Pole, states in part:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The radial clearance between different guys, different span wires, or different guys and span wires, attached to the same pole shall not be less than 3 inches.</i></p> <p>A communication guy wire and an SCE guy wire were touching at midspan.</p>		

4.	Location:	Pole No. CIT 34987
	Previous SCE Visit Details:	09/14/2012
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	02/26/2013
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Inadequate Clearance between SCE Triplex and Communication Service Drop</u>		
<p>GO 95, Rule 38, Minimum Clearances of Wires from Other Wires, states in part:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The minimum vertical, horizontal or radial clearances of wires from other wires shall not be less than the values given in Table 2 and are based on a temperature of 60° F. and no wind.</i></p> <p>Table 2, Case No. 9, Column C requires 36 inches of vertical clearance between supply conductors and communication service drops. An SCE triplex and a communication service drop had less than 36 inches of vertical separation.</p>		

5.	Location:	Pole No. 4660018E
	Previous SCE Visit Details:	09/13/2012
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	02/26/2013
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Third Party GO 95 Safety Hazard Not Reported</u>		
GO 95, Rule 18-B, Notification of Safety Hazards, states in part:		
<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 communication cable had a broken lashing wire. SCE did not notify the communication company of this unsafe condition.		

6.	Location:	Pole No. 4697935E
	Previous SCE Visit Details:	09/13/2012
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	02/26/2013
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Third Party GO 95 Safety Hazard Not Reported</u>		
GO 95, Rule 18-B, Notification of Safety Hazards, states in part:		
<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 communication cable had a broken lashing wire. SCE did not notify the communication company of this unsafe condition.		

7.	Location:	Pole No. 30541S
	Previous SCE Visit Details:	09/13/2012
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	02/26/2013
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Damaged/Missing High Voltage Sign</u>		
GO 95, Rule 51.6-A, High Voltage Marking, states in part:		
<i>Poles which support line conductors of more than 750 volts shall be marked with high voltage signs.</i>		
The high voltage sign on the crossarm was damaged.		

8.	Location:	Pole No. 30540S
	Previous SCE Visit Details:	09/13/2012
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	02/26/2013
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Damaged/Missing High Voltage Sign</u>		
GO 95, Rule 51.6-A, High Voltage Marking, states in part:		
<i>Poles which support line conductors of more than 750 volts shall be marked with high voltage signs.</i>		
The high voltage sign on the crossarm was damaged.		

9.	Location:	Pole No. 4593989E
	Previous SCE Visit Details:	12/11/2012
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	02/26/2013
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<p data-bbox="204 527 1382 558"><u>Inadequate Clearance between SCE Triplex and Communication Service Drop</u></p> <p data-bbox="204 600 1247 632">GO 95, Rule 54.8-C4, From Communication Service Drops, states in part:</p> <p data-bbox="342 674 1474 884"><i>The radial clearance between communication service drop conductors and supply service drop conductors may be less than 48 inches as specified in Table 2, Column C, Cases 4 and 9; Column D, Cases 3 and 8, but shall be not less than 24 inches. Where within 15 feet of the point of attachment of either service drop on a building, this clearance may be further reduced but shall be not less than 12 inches.</i></p> <p data-bbox="204 926 1365 995">An SCE triplex and a communication service drop had less than a 12 inches radial clearance within 15 feet from the point of attachment.</p>		