

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



January 20, 2015

Melvin Stark
Principal Manager, Maintenance & Inspections/Asset Management
Southern California Edison
3 Innovation Way
Pomona, CA 91768

EA2014-011

SUBJECT: Electric Audit of SCE's Santa Monica District

Dear Mr. Stark:

On behalf of the Electric Safety and Reliability Branch of the California Public Utilities Commission, Koko Tomassian of my staff conducted an electric audit of Southern California Edison's (SCE) Santa Monica District from June 9, 2014 to June 13, 2014. 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 (GOs). A copy of the audit findings itemizing the violations is enclosed. Please advise me no later than February 20, 2015, 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 Koko Tomassian at (213) 576-7099 or koko.tomassian@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue 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 identified during the field inspection of the audit and were not documented and/or addressed by SCE during its last detailed inspection as required by General Order 165:

1.	Location:	Santa Monica District
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	June 9, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Late Work Orders</u>		
<p>GO 165, Section IV, Standards for Inspection, Record-keeping, and Reporting, States:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“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.”</i></p> <p>During the audit, my staff identified 41 work orders, from 2011 to 2014, that were completed late.</p>		

2.	Location:	Pole No.: 2255330E
	Previous SCE Visit Details:	January 7, 2014 – Overhead (OH) Detailed Inspection
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	June 10, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<p data-bbox="155 569 428 600"><u>Missing Guy Guard</u></p> <p data-bbox="155 642 899 674">Go 95, Rule 56.9, Guy Marker (Guy Guard), states in part:</p> <p data-bbox="248 716 1300 789"><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 data-bbox="155 831 1390 905">The pole supported a down guy wire which was not guarded with a substantial marker of suitable material.</p> <p data-bbox="155 947 1289 978"><u>Insufficient Clearance between Power Down Guy Wire and Communications Cable</u></p> <p data-bbox="155 1020 1438 1125">GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Column C, Case 19 requires the minimum radial separation between communication conductors and guys and span wires passing conductors supported on the same poles to be three inches.</p> <p data-bbox="155 1167 1016 1199">An SCE down guy wire was touching a communications conductor.</p>		

3.	Location:	Pole No.: 855431E
	Previous SCE Visit Details:	January 9, 2014 – Overhead (OH) Detailed Inspection
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	June 10, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Damaged/Missing High Voltage Sign</u>		
GO 95, Rule 51.6-A, High Voltage Marking, states in part:		
<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>		
The High Voltage sign on the crossarm was damaged.		

4.	Location:	Pole No.: 1980173E
	Previous SCE Visit Details:	January 9, 2014 – Overhead (OH) Detailed Inspection
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	June 10, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Third Party Safety Hazard – Cut and Low Hanging Communications Conductors</u>		
GO 95, Rule 18-B, Notification of Safety Hazards, States:		
<p style="text-align: center;"><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>		
The pole supported communications cables that were hanging several feet from the ground. SCE did not notify the communications company of this safety hazard when it last inspected the pole.		

5.	Location:	Pole No.: 4386950E
	Previous SCE Visit Details:	March 17, 2014 – Overhead (OH) Detailed Inspection
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	June 10, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Missing Guy Guard</u>		
<p>Go 95, Rule 56.9, 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>		

6.	Location:	Pole No.: 1028074E
	Previous SCE Visit Details:	March 17, 2014 – Overhead (OH) Detailed Inspection
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	June 10, 2014
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Third Party Safety Hazard – Broken Communications Lashing Wire</u>		
<p>GO 95, Rule 18-B, Notification of Safety Hazards, States:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><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 pole supported a broken communications lashing wire. SCE did not notify the communications company of this safety hazard when it last inspected the pole.</p>		