PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



October 3, 2018

Greg Ferree Vice President Distribution Business Line Southern California Edison 3 Innovation Way Pomona, CA 91768

Ron Nichols Sr. Vice President Regulatory Affairs and Nuclear Southern California Edison 2244 Walnut Grove Avenue Rosemead, CA 91770

Mr. Ferree and Mr. Nichols:

Southern California Edison (SCE) is hereby cited \$8,000,000 for violations of General Order (GO) 95, Rule 18-A, Rule 31.1, Rule 37, Rule 48, and Public Utilities Code (PU Code) Section 451 related to injuries received from a low-hanging SCE 12 kV conductor due to a SCE crossarm failure, which occurred on August 1, 2015. The attached Citation # D.16-09-055 E.18-02-001 amended is issued today pursuant to Decision 16-09-055. Please find attached the citation and its enclosure.

If confidential information exists within any enclosures to the citation, please send SCE's proposed redactions, including your justification for each proposed redaction, by 5:00 p.m. on October 10, 2018, to Charlotte TerKeurst, Electric Safety and Reliability Branch, at <u>charlotte.terkerust@cpuc.ca.gov</u>.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A francesto

Élizaveta Malashenko Director, Safety and Enforcement Division California Public Utilities Commission 320 W 4th Street, Suite 500 Los Angeles, CA 90013

Cc: Lee Palmer, Deputy Director, Safety and Enforcement Division, CPUC Charlotte TerKeurst, Program Manager, Electric Safety and Reliability Branch, CPUC Fadi Daye, Program Project Supervisor, Electric Safety and Reliability Branch, CPUC Koko Tomassian, P.E., Senior Utilities Engineer, Electric Safety and Reliability Branch, CPUC



Utility/Operator ID#: U338E

CITATION ISSUED PURSUANT TO DECISION 16-09-055

Electrical Corporation (Utility) To Which Citation is Issued:

Southern California Edison (U338E)

OFFICER OF THE RESPONDENT:

Greg Ferree Vice President Distribution Business Line Southern California Edison 3 Innovation Way Pomona, CA 91768

CITATION:

Southern California Edison (SCE or Utility) is cited for three violations that lasted 2 days each and two violations that lasted 1,389 days each. Safety and Enforcement Division (SED) discovered these violations in its investigation of Incident Number E20150801-01, which occurred on August 1, 2015. One person was injured when he struck a low-hanging energized conductor while riding an off-road vehicle, and two people were injured when they contacted the energized conductor while trying to provide aid to the injured individual. The total financial penalty for this citation is \$8,000,000.

VIOLATIONS:

SCE is cited for violating General Order (GO) 95, Rule 31.1, Rule 48, Rule 37, Rule 18-A, and Public Utilities Code (PU Code), Section (§) 451 as described below. These violations occurred in the period before and when an SCE crossarm broke, causing an energized conductor it initially supported to become suspended in the air with reduced above-ground clearance. Subsequently, one person was injured when he struck the energized conductor while riding an off-road vehicle, and two people were injured when they contacted the energized conductor while trying to provide aid to the injured individual.

1. General Order 95, Rule 31.1 Design, Construction, and Maintenance, states:

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.

The crossarm failed and broke under conditions that were not abnormal, causing a piece



Citation Date: Original February 12, 2018 and amended October 3, 2018 **Citation #:** D.16-09-055 E.18-02-001 amended

Utility/Operator ID#: U338E

of the crossarm to fall to the ground and the conductor it supports to be suspended in the air. SCE is in violation of GO 95, Rule 31.1, for failing to ensure that the crossarm was installed and maintained in a way that it does not break during conditions normal to the area.

The nut that was securing the insulator (that supported the 12 kV conductor with insufficient above ground clearance) to the crossarm had been missing since at least October 13, 2011, when an SCE inspection found that the nut was missing. SCE is in violation of GO 95, Rule 31.1 for failing to ensure that the insulator is properly supported and secured to the crossarm.

2. General Order 95, Rule 48 Strength of Materials, states:

Structural members and their connection shall be designed and constructed so that the structures and parts thereof will not fail or be seriously distorted at any load less than their maximum working loads (developed under the current construction arrangements with loadings as specified in Rule 43) multiplied by the safety factors in Rule 44. Values used for the strength of material shall comply with the safety factors specified in Rule 44.

The above rule requires utilities to ensure that a crossarm is designed, installed, and constructed so that it does not fail or become seriously distorted at any load less than its maximum working load multiplied by the safety factors in Rule 44. There are no indications that there were any abnormal conditions at or just before the time of the incident that could have caused a properly designed, installed, and maintained crossarm to break. SCE is in violation of GO 95, Rule 48, for failing to ensure that its crossarm did not fail or become seriously distorted at a load that was less than the maximum working load multiplied by the safety factor in Rule 44.

3. GO 95 Rule 37, Minimum Clearances of Wires above Railroads, Thoroughfares, Buildings, Etc., states in part:

Clearance between overhead conductors, guys, messengers or trolley span wires and tops of rails, surfaces of thoroughfares or other generally accessible areas across, along or above which any of the former pass; also clearances between conductors, guys, structures, or other objects, shall not be less than those set forth in Table 1, at a Temperature of 60°F and no wind...

The above rule requires supply conductors of 750-22,500 volts installed above ground along thoroughfares in rural districts or across other areas capable of being traversed by vehicles or agricultural equipment to maintain a minimum ground clearance of 25 feet. At the time of the incident, the SCE overhead conductor had an above ground clearance less than 8 feet, which is less than the GO 95 minimum requirement of 25 feet. SCE is in violation of GO 95, Rule 37, for failing to ensure that its 12 kV overhead conductor maintained at least a 25 foot ground clearance above a thoroughfare capable of being traversed by vehicles.



Utility/Operator ID#: U338E

4. GO 95 Rule 18-A, Resolution of Safety Hazards And General Order 95 Violations, in effect when SCE found that the nut was missing, states in relevant part:

Each company (including utilities and CIPs) is responsible for taking appropriate corrective action to remedy safety hazards and GO 95 violations posed by their facility... For purposes of this rule, "safety hazard" means a condition that poses a significant threat to life or property... All companies shall establish an auditable maintenance program for their facilities and lines. Further, all companies must include a timeline for corrective actions to be taken following the identification of a safety hazard or violation of General Orders 95 or 128 on the companies' facilities. The auditable maintenance program should be developed and implemented based on the following principles.

(1) Priorities shall be assigned based on the specifics of the safety hazard or violation as related to direct impact and the probability for impact on safety or reliability using the following factors:

- Type of facility or equipment;
- * Location;
- * Accessibility;
- * Climate;
- * Direct or potential impact on operations, customers, electrical company workers, communications workers, and the general public;
- * Whether the safety hazard or violation is located in an Extreme or Very High Fire Threat zone.
- (2) There will be three priority levels, as follows:
 - a) Level 1:
 - Immediate safety and/or reliability risk with high probability for significant impact.
 - Take action immediately, either by fully repairing the condition, or by temporarily repairing and reclassifying the condition to a lower priority.
 - b) Level 2:
 - Variable (non-immediate high to low) safety and/or reliability risk.
 - Take action to correct within specified time period (fully repair, or by temporarily repairing and reclassifying the condition to a lower priority).
 - Time period for correction to be determined at the point of identification by a qualified company representative:
 - Overhead: 0-59 months
 - Where communications company actions result in electric utility GO violations, the electric utility's remedial action will be to transmit a single documented notice of identified violations to the communications company for compliance.



Citation Date: Original February 12, 2018 and amended October 3, 2018 **Citation #:** D.16-09-055 E.18-02-001 amended

Utility/Operator ID#: U338E

- c) Level 3:
 - Acceptable safety and/or reliability risk.
 - Take action (re-inspect, re-evaluate, or repair) at or before the next detailed inspection.
- d) Exceptions (Levels 2 and 3 only) Correction times may be extended under reasonable circumstances, such as:
 - Third party refusal
 - Customer issue
 - No access
 - Permits required
 - System emergencies (e.g. fires, severe weather conditions)

On October 13, 2011, SCE personnel found that the nut securing the insulator (that supported the 12 kV conductor with insufficient above ground clearance) to the crossarm was missing. SCE personnel created a work order for the missing nut; however, this hazardous and dangerous condition was prioritized as a "Priority 3," meaning that the condition was deemed to be an acceptable safety and/or reliability risk. SCE did not set a due date for corrective action. SCE has considered correction of Priority 3 conditions as "opportunity maintenance," and typically would not correct a Priority Level 3 condition unless other higher priority work is being performed on the pole.

A missing nut is a hazardous and dangerous condition, as the lack of a nut allows movement of the insulator pin, unrestricted by the securing nut. This movement could allow the insulator to fall off the crossarm, for example, in windy conditions not abnormal to the area. Also, movement of the insulator pin within the pinhole, unrestricted by the securing nut, subjects the crossarm to damaging tensile stress that can result in a crossarm failure. Either type of failure could cause the energized conductor supported on the insulator to fall to the ground or become suspended with insufficient above ground clearance and thus be easily accessible to the public, as happened in this incident. SED concludes that this hazardous and dangerous condition created by the missing nut was an "immediate safety and/or reliability risk with high probability for significant impact." Therefore, SCE is in violation of GO 95, Rule 18-A for failing to correctly prioritize and immediately correct the violation of the missing insulator nut.

5. PU Code, § 451, states in part:

Every public utility shall furnish and maintain such adequate, efficient, just, and reasonable service, instrumentalities, equipment, and facilities, including telephone facilities, as defined in Section 54.1 of the Civil Code, as are necessary to promote the safety, health, comfort, and convenience of its patrons, employees, and the public.

The above mandate requires, in part, that public utilities furnish and maintain their equipment and facilities as necessary to adequately promote public safety. On October 13, 2011, SCE personnel identified that the nut securing the insulator (that supported the 12 kV conductor with insufficient above ground clearance) to the crossarm was missing. SCE failed to recognize the severity and hazard of this GO 95 violation. Consequently, SCE prioritized the issue as "Priority 3" and allowed the condition to remain uncorrected for several years. As such, SCE is in violation of PU Code § 451 for failing to maintain its



Utility/Operator ID#: U338E

equipment and facilities as necessary to promote the safety, health, comfort, and convenience of the public.

ENCLOSURES:

The following enclosures were used to establish the findings of fact:

Enclosure 1 – SED Incident Investigation Report, dated April 15, 2016

Enclosure 2 – SED Notice of Violation (NOV), dated April 11, 2017

Enclosure 3 – SCE Response to SED's NOV, dated May 12, 2017

Enclosure 4 – SCE's Initial Incident Report

Enclosure 5 – SCE's Section 315 Letter

Enclosure 6 – SCE Notification No. 403983607

Enclosure 7 – SED Supplemental Incident Investigation Report, dated September 29, 2018

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The above violations are documented in the attached *Enclosure 1 – SED Incident Investigation Report* which is based on the following: SED's field observations and measurements; SED interviews with witnesses and SCE personnel; and SED's review of SCE's records and data request responses, and in the attached *Enclosure 7 – SED Supplemental Incident Investigation Report,* which is based on the following: SED's discovery of SCE's knowledge of the subject pin insulator being unsecured following an inspection in October 2011; SED's analysis of the risks associated with an unsecured insulator, including the structural and mechanical impacts such a condition would impose on a crossarm; and the likely contribution of this condition to the crossarm failure and subsequent injuries.



Public Utilities Commission

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Citation Date: Original February 12, 2018 and amended October 3, 2018 Citation #: D.16-09-055 E.18-02-001 amended

Utility/Operator ID#: U338E

SED CITATION ANALYSIS

Element	Staff Finding
Number of violation(s) and duration of violation(s)	One violation of GO 95, Rule 31.1 from August 1, 2015 to August 2, 2015 (2 days) for failing to ensure that the crossarm was installed and maintained in a way that it does not break during conditions normal to the area.
	One violation of GO 95, Rule 31.1 from October 13, 2011 to August 2, 2015 (1,389 days) for failing to ensure that the nut securing the insulator (that supported the 12 kV conductor with insufficient above ground clearance) to the crossarm was maintained for its intended function.
	One violation of GO 95, Rule 48, from August 1, 2015 to August 2, 2015 (2 days), for failing to ensure that its crossarm did not fail or become seriously distorted at a load that was less than the maximum working load multiplied by the safety factor in Rule 44.
	One violation of GO 95, Rule 37, from August 1, 2015 to August 2, 2015 (2 days), for failing to ensure that its 12 kV overhead conductor maintained at least a 25 foot ground clearance above a thoroughfare capable of being traversed by vehicles.
	One violation of GO 95, Rule 18-A, from October 13, 2011 to August 2, 2015 (1,389 days) for failing to correctly prioritize and immediately correct the hazardous and dangerous condition created by the missing nut.
	One violation of PU Code § 451 from October 13, 2011 to August 2, 2015 (1,389 days) for failing to maintain its equipment and facilities as necessary to promote the safety, health, comfort, and convenience of the public.



Citation Date: Original February 12, 2018 and amended October 3, 2018 Citation #: D.16-09-055 E.18-02-001 amended

Utility/Operator ID#: U338E

Element	Staff Finding
Severity or gravity of the offense	The incident resulted in injuries to three members of the public ("victim 1", "victim 2" and "victim 3"). Victim 1 sustained a laceration to his neck. Victim 2 sustained third-degree burns to his left hand, bicep, and abdomen. Victim 3 sustained an electrical shock. In addition, members of the public and utility workers were exposed to a safety hazard for at least 1,389 days, during which the hazardous and dangerous condition due to the missing nut on the insulator existed without corrective action by SCE.



Citation Date: Original February 12, 2018 and amended October 3, 2018 Citation #: D.16-09-055 E.18-02-001 amended

Utility/Operator ID#: U338E

Element	Staff Finding
Conduct of the utility	 On October 13, 2011, SCE conducted a detailed inspection of pole number 43502S and discovered that a primary insulator pin on the crossarm was missing the nut required to secure the pin, insulator, and conductor to the crossarm. SCE subsequently prioritized this GO 95 violation as "Priority 3" with no specified date for corrective action. This safety hazard remained uncorrected at the time of the incident. On July 29, 2015, SCE's Twentynine Palms region began experiencing wind gusts of up to 70 mph. As a result, SCE activated its normal emergency operations at the local district level. On July 30, 2015, SCE assigned damage assessment teams (DATs) to perform storm damage control in the Twentynine Palms district. In response to reports from DATs of widespread damage, inaccessible roads, and other logistical considerations, SCE ordered a helicopter patrol of SCE's overhead facilities in the Twentynine Palms district. The patrol revealed extensive crossarm damage over a large area on one of the circuits in the service territory, which resulted in the helicopter troubleman requesting DATs be dispatched to the area when weather and road conditions permitted for further investigation. On August 1, 2015, three members of the public were riding off-road vehicles when they contacted an SCE conductor and received injuries. The crossarm that supported the conductor was broken, causing the conductor to be suspended in the air at a height below the minimum required overhead clearance. The circuit-branch of the North Adobe 12kV circuit where the incident occurred was not identified by the helicopter patrol as requiring additional assessment.



Utility/O	perator	ID#:	U338E
ounty/o	perator	D <i>m</i> .	0000

Prior history of similar violation(s)	SED's incident investigations have found SCE in violation of GO 95, Rule 44, 15 times since 2011 (Rule 44 is referenced in Rule 48). Examples include:
	 E20160106-01 – SCE in violation of Rule 44.3 for failing to show that a pole met the safety factors specified in Rule 44.1.
	 E20150719-01 – SCE in violation of Rule 44.3 for failing to show that two poles met the safety factors specified in Rule 44.1.
	 E20140818-02 – SCE in violation of Rule 44.3 for failing to show that two poles met the safety factors specified in Rule 44.1.
	SED's incident investigations have found SCE in violation of GO 95, Rule 31.1, 12 times since 2011. Examples include:
	 E20151118-01 – SCE in violation of Rule 31.1 for failing to maintain a one-bolt aluminum connector
	 E20150921-01 – SCE in violation of Rule 31.1 for failing to upgrade a transformer that subsequently failed.
	• E20140718-02 – SCE in violation of Rule 31.1 for failing to obtain the safety factors of two poles (that subsequently failed) to ensure compliance with Rule 44.
	SED's incident investigations have found SCE in violation of GO 95, Rule 37, 3 times since 2011. Examples include:
	 E20140616-02 – SCE in violation of Rule 37 for failing to ensure a 16 kV conductor had sufficient vertical clearance above a walkable surface.
	SCE has admitted that it violated PU Code Section 451, including in the following incidents:
	• With respect to the operation, maintenance, and monitoring of its secondary network in Long Beach, vault accessibility and inspection issues, and improper installation of cables inside a vault (D.17-09-024 in I.16-07-007).
	 By failing to take prompt action to prevent pole overloading on joint poles in Malibu Canyon (D.13-09-028 in I.09-01-018).
	SCE admitted that it violated Rule 31.1 and PU Code Section 451 by allowing two overhead conductors to come into contact or near contact with each other, which caused one conductor to break and fall to the ground at the site in San Bernardino where three fatalities occurred (D.14-08-009 in I.14-03-004).



Citation Date: Original February 12, 2018 and amended October 3, 2018 Citation #: D.16-09-055 E.18-02-001 amended Utility/Operator ID#: U338E

Element	Staff Finding
Self-reporting of the violation	Not self-reported; SED discovered the violations during investigation of the reported incident.
Financial resources of the utility	5.0 million electric customers, \$5.182 billion authorized General Rate Case revenues for test year 2015.
The totality of the circumstances	Aggravating factors include the injuries to three members of the public and SCE's failure to acknowledge the severity of and public safety hazard caused by an unsecured pin insulator and allowing the condition to remain uncorrected for almost four years. Mitigating factors include the actions SCE took, prior to the incident, to determine the damage to its facilities due to the storm. SCE also remedied the violations the next day after the incident. Other factors to consider are that (1) although SCE was generally cooperative during SED's initial investigation, SCE did not cooperate fully with SED during the discovery process after SCE appealed the initial citation; and (2) SCE possesses sufficient financial resources to pay the penalties.
The role of precedent	N/A
Resultant Citation Taking All of	\$8,000,000 consistent with the administrative limit on citations adopted in Decision 16-09-055.



Citation Date: Original February 12, 2018 and amended October 3, 2018 Citation #: D.16-09-055 E.18-02-001 amended

Utility/Operator ID#: U338E

RESPONSE:

Respondent is called upon to provide a response to this Citation by: **5:00 PM on November 2, 2018**. By way of such response, Respondent, within 30 calendar days, must either pay the amount of the penalty set forth in this citation¹, or appeal² the citation. In addition, the Respondent must do one of the following:

- (1) For violations constituting immediate safety hazards: Respondent must immediately correct the immediate safety hazards.
- (2) For violations that do not constitute immediate safety hazards: Violations that do not constitute immediate safety hazards must be corrected within 30 days after the citation is served. If said violations that do not constitute immediate safety hazards cannot be corrected within 30 days, then the Respondent must submit a detailed Compliance Plan to the Director of SED within 30 days after the citation issues, unless the utility and the Director of SED, before the expiration of the 30 day period, agree in writing to another date, reflecting the soonest that the Respondent can correct the violations. The Compliance Plan must provide a detailed description of when the violation will be corrected, the methodology to be utilized, and a statement supported by a declaration from the Respondent's Chief Executive Officer or appropriate designee (CEO Declaration) stating that in the Respondent's best judgment, the time that will be taken to correct the violation will not affect the safety or integrity of the operating system or endanger public safety.

<u>Note:</u> Respondent will forfeit the right to appeal the citation by failing to do one of the options outlined above within 30 days. Payment of a citation or filing a Notice of Appeal does not excuse the Respondent from curing the violation. The amount of the penalty may continue to accrue until a Notice of Appeal is filed. Penalties are stayed during the appeal process. A late payment will be subject to a penalty of 10% per year, compounded daily and to be assessed beginning the calendar day following the payment-due date. The Commission may take additional action to recover any unpaid fine and ensure compliance with applicable statutes and Commission orders.

¹ For fines paid pursuant to Pub. Util. Code §2107 and D.16-09-055 Respondent shall submit a certified check payable to California Public Utilities Commission using the attached Citation Payment Form. Upon payment, the fine will be deposited in the State Treasury to the credit of the General Fund and this citation will become final.

² Respondent may Appeal this citation by completing and submitting a Notice of Appeal Form. Please see the attached document, "Directions For Submitting An Appeal To A Citation Issued Pursuant to Decision 16-09-055" for information on the appeals process and the attached "Notice of Appeal Of Citation Form."



Public Utilities Commission

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Citation Date: Original February 12, 2018 and amended October 3, 2018 Citation #: D.16-09-055 E.18-02-001 amended

Utility/Operator ID#: U338E

NOTIFICATION TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES:

As soon as is reasonable and necessary, and <u>no later than 10 calendar days</u> after service of the citation is effected, Respondent must provide a notification to the Chief Administrative Officer or similar authority in the city and county where the violation occurred. <u>Within 10</u> <u>days of providing such notification</u>, Respondent must serve an affidavit to the Director of SED, at the mail or e-mail address noted below, attesting that the local authorities have been notified; the date(s) for when notification was provided; and the name(s) and contact information for each local authority so notified.

The CPUC expects the Utility to take actions, as soon as feasible, to correct, mitigate, or otherwise make safe all violations noted on the Citation regardless of the Utility's intentions to accept or appeal the violation(s) noted in the Citation.

1 france HKC

Elizaveta Malashenko Director Safety and Enforcement Division California Public Utilities Commission 505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102 <u>elizaveta.malashenko@cpuc.ca.gov</u>



Citation Date: Original February 12, 2018 and amended October 3, 2018 Citation #: D.16-09-055 E.18-02-001 amended

Utility/Operator ID#: U338E

CITATION PAYMENT FORM

I (we)	hereby agree to comply with this citation	
dated	_, and have corrected/mitigated the violation(s)	
noted in the citation on	and no later than,	
all work to make permanent correction	ns to any mitigated, or otherwise remaining	
concerns related to the violation(s) will	Il be completed as noted in the Compliance Plan	
we have submitted to the Director of S	SED and, herewith, pay a fine in the amount of	
\$as included i	n the citation.	

Signature of Electrical Corporation's Treasurer, Chief Financial Officer, or President/Chief Executive Officer, or delegated Officer thereof

(Signature)

(Date)

(Printed Name and Title)

Payment must be with a certified check made payable to the *California Public Utilities Commission* and sent to the below address. Please include the citation number on the memorandum line of the check to ensure your payment is properly applied.

California Public Utilities Commission Attn: Fiscal Office 505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102-3298

NOTE: A copy of the completed Citation Payment Form must be sent to the Director of the Safety and Enforcement Division, via email or regular mail, to the address provided on the Citation.



Citation Date: Original February 12, 2018 and amended October 3, 2018 Citation #: D.16-09-055 E.18-02-001 amended

Utility/Operator ID#: U338E

DIRECTIONS FOR SUBMITTING AN APPEAL TO A CITATION ISSUED PURSUANT TO DECISION 16-09-055

Within 30 calendar days of the Respondent being served with a <u>CITATION ISSUED</u> <u>PURSUANT TO DECISION 16-09-055</u>, Respondent may appeal the citation. Beyond 30 calendar days of being served with the citation, Respondent is in default and, as a result, is considered as having forfeited rights to appeal the citation. The Respondent must still correct the violation(s) as instructed in the Response section of this citation.

To appeal the citation, Appellant must file a Notice of Appeal (including a completed title page complying with Rule 1.6 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, and attached Notice of Appeal Form) along with copies of any materials the Appellant wants to provide in support of its appeal with the Commission's Docket Office **and** must serve the Notice of Appeal, at a minimum, on

- 1) The Chief Administrative Law Judge (with an electronic copy to: <u>ALJ_Div_Appeals_Coordinator@cpuc.ca.gov</u>),
- 2) The Director of the Safety and Enforcement Division
- 3) The Executive Director
- 4) General Counsel
- 5) The Director of the Office of Ratepayer Advocates

at the address listed below within 30 calendar days of the date on which the Appellant is served the Citation. The Appellant must file a proof of service to this effect at the same time the Appellant files the Notice of Appeal. The Notice of Appeal must at a minimum state: (a) the date of the citation that is appealed; and (b) the rationale for the appeal with specificity on all grounds for the appeal of the citation.

California Public Utilities Commission 505 Van Ness Ave. San Francisco, CA 94102 Attn: <Insert Title>

NOTE: Submission of a *Notice of Appeal Form* in no way diminishes Appellant's responsibility for correcting the violation described in the citation, or otherwise ensuring the safety of facilities or conditions that underlie the violations noted in the Citation.

Ex Parte Communications as defined by Rule 8.1(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, are prohibited from the date the citation is issued through the date a final order is issued on the citation appeal.



Citation Date: Original February 12, 2018 and amended October 3, 2018 Citation #: D.16-09-055 E.18-02-001 amended

Utility/Operator ID#: U338E

After receipt of the Appellant's *Notice of Appeal Form*, a hearing will be convened before an Administrative Law Judge. At least ten days before the date of the hearing, the Appellant will be notified and provided with the location, date, and time for the hearing. At the hearing,

- (a) Appellant may be represented by an attorney or other representative, but any such representation shall be at the sole expense of the Appellant;
- (b) Appellant may request a transcript of the hearing, but must pay for the cost of the transcript in accordance with the Commission's usual procedures;
- (c) Appellant is entitled to the services of an interpreter at the Commission's expense upon written request to the Chief Administrative Law Judge not less than five business days prior to the date of the hearing;
- Appellant is entitled to a copy of or electronic reference to "Resolution ALJ-299 Establishing Pilot Program Citation Appeal and General Order 156 Appellate Rules (Citation Appellate Rules)"; and
- (e) Appellant may bring documents to offer in evidence (Rule 13.6 (Evidence) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure applies) and/or call witnesses to testify on Appellant's behalf. At the Commission's discretion, the hearing in regard to the Appellant's appeal can be held in a CPUC hearing room at either of the following locations:

San Francisco:

505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102

Los Angeles:

320 West 4th Street, Suite 500 Los Angeles, CA 90013

The hearing(s) held in regard to the Appellant's appeal will be adjudicated in conformance with all applicable Public Utilities Code requirements.



Utility/Operator ID#: U338E

<u>Notice of Appeal Form</u> <u>Appeal from Citation issued by Safety and Enforcement Division</u> (Pursuant to Decision 16-09-055)

	(Citation Date:
[Name]	(Citation #: D.16-09-055
	ι	Jtility/Operator ID#:
[Title]		Appeal Date:
[Utility Name]		
[Mailing Address]		
[City, CA Zip Code]		
Appeal of	from	issued by Safety
[Utility/Operator Name]		n Number]
and Enforcement Division"	Lenour	- 1

Statements supporting Appellant's Appeal of Citation (You may use additional pages if needed and/or attach copies of supporting materials along with this form).



Citation Date: Original February 12, 2018 and amended October 3, 2018 **Citation #:** D.16-09-055 E.18-02-001 amended

Utility/Operator ID#: U338E

Enclosures to Accompany Utility Appeal

Utility to add list of Enclosures as appropriate: