

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



August 7, 2012

Robert F. LeMoine
Southern California Edison
Manager, Maintenance & Inspection
3 Innovation Way
Pomona, CA 91768

EA2012-005

SUBJECT: Audit of Southern California Edison's (SCE) San Joaquin District

Dear Mr. LeMoine:

On behalf of the Electric Safety and Reliability Branch of the California Public Utilities Commission, Mahmoud Intably and Koko Tomassian of my staff conducted an audit of SCE's facilities in San Joaquin District from April 16, 2012 to April 19, 2012. The audit included a review of SCE's maintenance records and 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 September 11, 2012, by electronic or hard copy, of all corrective measures taken by Southern California Edison to remedy and prevent such violations.

If you have any questions concerning this audit you can contact Mahmoud Intably at (213) 576-7016 or Mahmoud.Intably@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Stepanian", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

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
Mahmoud Intably, Utilities Engineer, CPUC

Audit Summary

1.	Location:	San Joaquin District
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	April 16 - 19, 2012
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Records Review and Inspections</u>		
GO 165, Section III(C): Record keeping		
Section III(C), states in part:		
<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>		
SCE audit summary report from 2010 - 2011 showed that 47 priority 2 work orders were completed late. In addition, SCE failed to document all GOs 95 and 128 problems at the time of inspections.		

2.	Structure ID / Location:	Pole No. 2052912E
	Date of SCE last overhead detailed inspection:	December 12, 2011
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	April 16, 2012
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<p data-bbox="191 560 1089 590"><u>Resolution of Safety Hazards and GO 95 Nonconformances</u></p> <p data-bbox="191 632 704 661">GO 95, Rule 18-A1c, states in parts:</p> <p data-bbox="326 705 1395 846"><i>“Where a communications company’s or electric utility’s actions result in GO nonconformances for another entity, that entity’s remedial action will be to transmit a single documented notice of identified nonconformances to the communications company or electric utility for compliance”</i></p> <p data-bbox="191 890 1321 957">The pole had a telephone service drop in climbing space. SCE did not notify the communication company when SCE last visited the pole.</p> <p data-bbox="191 1001 724 1031"><u>Reduced Clearance Between Wires</u></p> <p data-bbox="191 1075 1317 1104">GO 95, Rule 38, Minimum Clearances of Wires from Other Wires, states in part:</p> <p data-bbox="326 1148 1474 1251"><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 data-bbox="326 1295 1403 1362"><i>The clearances in Table 2 shall in no case be reduced more than 10 percent because of temperature and loading as specified in Rule 43”</i></p> <p data-bbox="191 1407 1455 1474">The pole had an SCE guy wire passing a communication cable with less than a three-inch radial separation. This violation was not documented when SCE last visited the pole.</p>		

3.	Structure ID / Location:	Pole No. 4367815E
	Date of SCE last overhead detailed inspection:	December 12, 2011
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	April 16, 2012
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<p data-bbox="191 583 638 625"><u>Exposed jumper connections</u></p> <p data-bbox="191 657 873 699">GO 95, Rule 54.10-E1, Insulation, states in part:</p> <p data-bbox="313 730 1433 846"><i>“The phase conductors, and their jumper connections, excluding jumper connections at the pole, shall be covered with insulation suitable for the voltage involved and shall conform with the requirements of Rule 20.9-G.”</i></p> <p data-bbox="191 877 1450 938">The pole had a service drop with damaged insulation on jumper connections at a point of attachment. This violation was not documented when SCE last visited the pole.</p>		

4.	Structure ID / Location:	Pole No. 2100183E
	Date of SCE last overhead detailed inspection:	December 12, 2011
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	April 16, 2012
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<p data-bbox="191 1346 516 1388"><u>Abandoned insulator</u></p> <p data-bbox="191 1419 922 1461">GO 95, Rule 31.6, Abandoned Lines, states in part:</p> <p data-bbox="313 1493 1490 1671"><i>“Lines or portions of lines permanently abandoned shall be removed by their owners so that such lines shall not become a public nuisance or a hazard to life or property. For the purposes of this rule, lines that are permanently abandoned shall be defined as those lines that are determined by their owner to have no foreseeable future use.”</i></p> <p data-bbox="191 1703 1450 1774">The pole had an abandoned insulator. This violation was not documented when SCE last visited the pole.</p>		

5.	Structure ID / Location:	Pole No. 4563603E
	Date of SCE last overhead detailed inspection:	December 12, 2011
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	April 16, 2012
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Loose V-brace support</u>		
GO 95, Rule 49.2-C, Strength, states in part:		
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>“Crossarms shall be securely supported by bracing, where necessary, to withstand unbalanced vertical loads and to prevent tipping of any arm sufficiently to decrease clearances below the values specified in Section III. Such bracing shall be securely attached to poles and crossarms.”</i></p>		
The pole supported a crossarm that had a loose V-brace support. This violation was not documented when SCE last visited the pole.		

6.	Structure ID / Location:	Pole No. 2162868E
	Date of SCE last overhead detailed inspection:	December 8, 2011
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	April 16, 2012
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<u>Joint use pole not stepped</u>		
GO 95, Rule 91.3-A1, Use of steps, states in part:		
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>“All jointly used poles which support supply conductors shall be provided with pole steps if vertical runs or risers are attached to the surface of such poles...”</i></p>		
The pole is a joint used pole with an SCE riser attached to the surface of the pole. However, the pole was not stepped. This violation was not documented when SCE last visited the pole.		

7.	Structure ID / Location:	Structure No. B5318356
	Date of SCE last Underground detailed inspection:	February 3, 2011
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	April 19, 2012
Explanation of Violation(s):		
<p><u>Corroded connector</u></p> <p>GO 128, Rule 12.2, Maintenance, state 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>The structure had a corroded secondary connector. This violation was not documented when SCE last visited the structure.</p>		