

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



December 15, 2014

EA2014-007

Jason Grace
Electric Operations Manager
Roseville Electric
City of Roseville
2070 Hilltop Circle
Roseville, CA 95747

SUBJECT: Audit of Roseville Electric

Dear Mr. Grace:

On behalf of the Electric Safety and Reliability Branch (ESRB) of the California Public Utilities Commission Yusef Collins and Jamie Lau of my staff conducted an electric distribution audit of Roseville Electric from April 14 to 18, 2014. The audit included a review of Roseville Electric's records and field inspections of Roseville Electric's facilities.

During the audit, we identified violations of one or more General Orders. A copy of the audit findings itemizing the violations is enclosed. Please advise me no later than January 19, 2015, by electronic or hard copy, of all corrective measures taken by Roseville Electric to remedy and prevent such violations.

If you have any questions concerning this audit please contact, Jamie Lau at (415) 703-2233 or jamie.lau@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, ESRB, CPUC
Alok Kumar, P.E., Senior Utilities Engineer Supervisor, ESRB, CPUC
Jamie Lau, P.E., Utilities Engineer, ESRB, CPUC

AUDIT FINDINGS

Company: Roseville Electric
 Electric Distribution Audit
 Date: April 14 to April 18, 2014

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| A. | Location: | Roseville Electric – City of Roseville |
| | Date Visited by CPUC: | 04/14/2014 - 04/18/2014 |
| Explanation of Violation(s): | | |
| <u>Lack of Priority Levels for GO 95 Nonconformance Work Orders</u> | | |
| <p>GO 95, Rule 18-A2, Resolution of Safety Hazards And General Order 95 Nonconformances, states in part:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>There shall be 3 priority levels.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">(i) <i>Level 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Immediate safety and/or reliability risk with high probability for significant impact.</i> • <i>Take action immediately, either by fully repairing the condition, or by temporarily repairing and reclassifying the condition to a lower priority.</i> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">(ii) <i>Level 2:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Variable(non-immediate high to low) safety and/or reliability risk.</i> • <i>Take action to correct within specified time period (fully repair, or by temporarily repairing and reclassifying the condition to a lower priority).</i> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Time period for correction to be determined at the time of identification by a qualified company representative but not to exceed: (1) 12 months for nonconformances that compromise worker safety, (2) 12 months for nonconformances that create a fire risk and are located in an Extreme or Very High Fire Threat Zone in Southern California, and (3) 59 months for all other Level 2 nonconformances.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">(iii) <i>Level 3:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Acceptable safety and/or reliability risk.</i> • <i>Take action (re-inspect, re-evaluate, or repair) as appropriate.</i> <p>At the time of the CPUC audit, Roseville Electric did not assign priority level for GO 95 nonconformance work orders.</p> | | |

| | | |
|-----------|---|---|
| B. | Location: | Roseville Electric – City of Roseville |
| | Date Visited by CPUC: | 04/14/2014 - 04/18/2014 |
| | Explanation of Violation(s): | |
| | <p data-bbox="250 401 1032 436"><u>Lack of Scheduled Date for Inspection Work Orders</u></p> <p data-bbox="250 472 899 508">GO 165, III-C, Record-Keeping, states in part:</p> <p data-bbox="344 546 1289 688"><i>For all inspections records shall specify the circuit, area, facility or equipment inspected, the inspector, the date of the inspection, and any problems (or items requiring corrective action) identified during each inspection, as well as the scheduled date of corrective action.</i></p> <p data-bbox="250 728 1349 800">At the time of the CPUC audit, Roseville Electric did not assign scheduled due date for work orders.</p> | |

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| C. | Location(s): | 920 Vine Avenue, Roseville |
| | Facility: | Overhead Conductor |
| | Date Visited by CPUC: | 04/15/2014 |
| Explanation of Violation(s): | | |
| <u>Foreign Attachment</u> | | |
| <p>GO 95, Rule 31.1, Design, Construction and Maintenance, states in part:</p> <p><i>For all particulars not specified in these rules, design, construction, and maintenance should be done in accordance with accepted good practice for the given local conditions known at the time by those responsible for the design, construction, or maintenance of communication or supply lines and equipment.</i></p> <p>GO 95, Rule 34, Foreign Attachments, states in part:</p> <p><i>Nothing in these rules shall be construed as permitting the unauthorized attachment, to supply, street light or communication poles or structures, of antennas, signs, posters, banners, decorations, wires, lighting fixtures, guys, ropes and any other such equipment foreign to the purposes of overhead electric line construction.</i></p> <p>During a pole transfer process in 2013, Roseville Electric found a communication conductor on the same joint poles with low above-ground clearance. Instead of notifying the communication company of the nonconformance, Roseville Electric tied a rope from its secondary conductor to elevate the communication conductor.</p> | | |

The following GO 95 and GO 128 violations were identified during the field inspection and were not documented and/or addressed by Roseville Electric during its last detailed inspection as required by General Order 165:

| | | |
|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| D. | Location(s): | 9214 Atkinson St., Roseville |
| | Facility: | Pole "PP4418" |
| | Date Visited by CPUC: | 04/17/2014 |
| Explanation of Violation(s): | | |
| <p><u>Missing High Voltage Sign</u></p> <p>GO 95, Rule 51.6, Marking and Guarding, states in part:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Poles which support line conductors of more than 750 volts shall be marked with high voltage signs.</i></p> <p>The High Voltage sign on the pole was missing.</p> | | |

| | | |
|----|--|------------------------------|
| E. | Location(s): | 9100 Atkinson St., Roseville |
| | Facility: | Pole "PP4420" |
| | Date Visited by CPUC: | 04/17/2014 |
| | Explanation of Violation(s): | |
| | <p><u>Third-Party Notification</u></p> <p>GO 95, Rule 18-B, Notification of Safety Hazards, states in part:</p> <p><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>A communication ground wire installed on the surface of the pole was partially exposed. The exposed portion of ground wire was less than 7 feet above the ground. A safety hazard notification was not sent to the third party.</p> | |

| | | |
|---|------------------------------|---|
| F. | Location(s): | 1800 Booth Rd., Roseville |
| | Facility: | Overhead Conductor (between Pole "PP4783" and "PP4627") |
| | Date Visited by CPUC: | 04/17/2014 |
| Explanation of Violation(s): | | |
| <p><u>Third-Party Notification</u></p> <p>GO 95, Rule 18-B, Notification of Safety Hazards, states in part:</p> <p><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>An abandoned communications messenger wire had less than 10 feet above-ground clearance in area accessible to pedestrians. A safety hazard notification was not sent to the third party.</p> | | |

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| G. | Location: | Corner of Bedell Ln. and Booth Rd., Roseville |
| | Facility: | Pole "PP4629" |
| | Date Visited by CPUC: | 04/17/2014 |
| Explanation of Violation(s): | | |
| <p data-bbox="250 569 607 604"><u>Third-Party Notification</u></p> <p data-bbox="250 642 1153 678">GO 95, Rule 18-B, Notification of Safety Hazards, states in part:</p> <p data-bbox="344 716 1338 898"><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 data-bbox="250 936 1360 1005">The pole had an abandoned communications conductor with exposed ends. A safety hazard notification was not sent to the third party.</p> | | |

| | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|
| H. | Location: | 530 Sixth St., Roseville |
| | Facility: | Pole "PP6400" |
| | Date Visited by CPUC: | 04/17/2014 |
| | Explanation of Violation(s): | |
| | <p data-bbox="250 569 1084 604"><u>Down Guy in Contact with Communication Conductors</u></p> <p data-bbox="250 640 1386 716">GO 95, Table 2, Case 19-C, requires down guys and communication conductors supported on the same poles must have a minimum clearance of 3 inches.</p> <p data-bbox="250 751 1419 827">A down guy was in contact with communication conductors supported on the same poles.</p> | |

| | | |
|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| I. | Location: | 333 Oak Ridge Dr., Roseville |
| | Facility: | Pole "PP4666" |
| | Date Visited by CPUC: | 04/17/2014 |
| Explanation of Violation(s): | | |
| <p data-bbox="250 569 607 604"><u>Third-Party Notification</u></p> <p data-bbox="250 642 1151 678">GO 95, Rule 18-B, Notification of Safety Hazards, states in part:</p> <p data-bbox="344 716 1338 898"><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 data-bbox="250 936 1365 1045">A communications ground wire installed on the surface of the pole was partially exposed. The exposed portion of ground wire was less than 7 feet above the ground. A safety hazard notification was not sent to the third party.</p> | | |