

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



October 25, 2012

Ralph Morrow
Owner
Catalina Cable TV Co.
222 Metropole Avenue
P.O. Box 2143
Avalon, CA 90704

CA2012-008

SUBJECT: Communication Infrastructure Provider (CIP) Audit of Catalina Cable TV Co.

Dear Mr. Morrow:

On behalf of the Electric Safety and Reliability Branch of the California Public Utilities Commission, Koko Tomassian of my staff conducted a CIP Audit of Catalina Cable TV Co. (CCTV) from September 12, 2012 to September 13, 2012. The audit included a review of Catalina Cable TV Co.'s records and field inspections of CCTV's facilities.

During the audit, my staff found that CCTV does not have an inspection and maintenance program, nor record keeping protocols, as required in General Orders (GO) 95 and 128. A copy of the audit summary itemizing the violations discovered during the audit is enclosed. Please advise me no later than November 30, 2012, by electronic or hard copy, of all corrective measures taken by CCTV 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 "R. Stepanian".

Raffy Stepanian, P.E.
Program Manager
Electric Safety and Reliability Branch
Consumer Protection and Safety Division

Enclosure: Audit Summary

CC: Raymond Fugere, Program and Project Supervisor, CPUC

AUDIT SUMMARY

Company: Catalina Cable TV Co.

CIP Audit Date: September 12 to September 13, 2012

1.	Location:	Avalon, CA
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	September 12, 2012
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Inspection & Maintenance Program Deficiencies</u>		
<p>GO 95, Rule 80.1A-2, Statewide Inspection Requirements, states in part:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Each company shall prepare, follow, and modify as necessary, procedures for conducting patrol or detailed inspections for all of its Communication Lines throughout the State. Consistent with Rule 31.2, the type, frequency, and thoroughness of inspections shall be based upon...</i></p> <p>GO 128, Rule 12.2, Design, Construction, and Maintenance, states in part:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Systems shall be maintained in such condition as to secure safety to workmen and the public in general. Systems and portions thereof constructed, reconstructed, or replaced on or after the effective date of these rules shall be kept in conformity with the requirement of these rules.</i></p> <p>GO 128, Rule 17.2, Inspection, states:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Systems shall be inspected by the operator frequently and thoroughly for the purpose of ensuring [sic] that they are in good condition and in conformance with all applicable requirements of these rules.</i></p> <p>CCTV does not currently have inspection or maintenance procedures in place that encompass all of its overhead and underground facilities. The frequency of inspections must be determined by CCTV at a level adequate enough to ensure that your facilities are in good condition and in compliance with GOs 95 and 128.</p>		

2.	Location:	Pole No.: 2381633E
	Previous CCTV Visit Details:	N/A
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	September 13, 2012
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Service Drop and Electric Down Guy Wire</u>		
<p>GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 19C, requires that:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Guys and span wires passing communication conductors (including service drops) supported on the same pole must maintain a three (3) inch radial separation.</i></p> <p>The pole had a communication service drop in contact with a guy wire.</p>		

3.	Location:	Pole No.: X10141E
	Previous CCTV Visit Details:	N/A
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	September 13, 2012
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership</u>		
<p>GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 8C, requires that:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Conductors and/or cables, on separate crossarms or other supports at different levels on the same pole must maintain a 12 inch vertical separation from communication conductors.</i></p> <p>The vertical clearance between cable TV and telecommunication cables, at midspan, was less than 12 inches.</p>		

4.	Location:	Pole No.: 2365067E
	Previous CCTV Visit Details:	N/A
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	September 13, 2012
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership</u>		
<p>GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 8C, requires that:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Conductors and/or cables, on separate crossarms or other supports at different levels on the same pole must maintain a 12 inch vertical separation from communication conductors.</i></p> <p>The vertical clearance between cable TV and telecommunication cables, at midspan, was less than 12 inches.</p>		

5.	Location:	Pole No.: 1492838E
	Previous CCTV Visit Details:	N/A
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	September 13, 2012
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership</u>		
<p>GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 8C, requires that:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Conductors and/or cables, on separate crossarms or other supports at different levels on the same pole must maintain a 12 inch vertical separation from communication conductors.</i></p> <p>The vertical clearance between cable TV and telecommunication cables, at midspan, was less than 12 inches.</p>		

6.	Location:	Pole No.: 1492839E
	Previous CCTV Visit Details:	N/A
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	September 13, 2012
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<p data-bbox="191 562 1268 594"><u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership</u></p> <p data-bbox="191 636 812 667">GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 8C, requires that:</p> <p data-bbox="321 709 1341 814"><i>Conductors and/or cables, on separate crossarms or other supports at different levels on the same pole must maintain a 12 inch vertical separation from communication conductors.</i></p> <p data-bbox="191 856 1446 919">The vertical clearance between cable TV and telecommunication cables, at midspan, was less than 12 inches.</p>		

7.	Location:	Pole No.: 1491738E
	Previous CCTV Visit Details:	N/A
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	September 13, 2012
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<p data-bbox="191 562 1406 596"><u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Conductor and Electric Down Guy Wire</u></p> <p data-bbox="191 638 829 672">GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 19C, requires that:</p> <p data-bbox="285 709 1479 781"><i>Guys and span wires passing communication conductors (including service drops) supported on the same pole must maintain a three (3) inch radial separation.</i></p> <p data-bbox="191 823 1097 856">The pole had a communication service drop in contact with a guy wire.</p> <p data-bbox="191 894 1268 928"><u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership</u></p> <p data-bbox="191 970 813 1003">GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 8C, requires that:</p> <p data-bbox="321 1041 1341 1155"><i>Conductors and/or cables, on separate crossarms or other supports at different levels on the same pole must maintain a 12 inch vertical separation from communication conductors.</i></p> <p data-bbox="191 1192 1446 1264">The vertical clearance between cable TV and telecommunication cables, at midspan, was less than 12 inches.</p>		

8.	Location:	Pole No.: 1491729E
	Previous CCTV Visit Details:	N/A
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	September 13, 2012
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership</u>		
<p>GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 8C, requires that:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Conductors and/or cables, on separate crossarms or other supports at different levels on the same pole must maintain a 12 inch vertical separation from communication conductors.</i></p> <p>The vertical clearance between cable TV and telecommunication cables, at midspan, was less than 12 inches.</p>		

9.	Location:	Pole No.: 1491731E
	Previous CCTV Visit Details:	N/A
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	September 13, 2012
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership</u>		
<p>GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 8C, requires that:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Conductors and/or cables, on separate crossarms or other supports at different levels on the same pole must maintain a 12 inch vertical separation from communication conductors.</i></p> <p>The vertical clearance between cable TV and telecommunication cables, at midspan, was less than 12 inches.</p>		