

## PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



March 25, 2020

CPUC-ID: 20191027-01

Lise Jordan, Sr. Director  
Regulatory Compliance and Quality Assurance  
Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E)  
77 Beale Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105

**SUBJECT:** Notice of Violation (NOV)

Dear Ms. Jordan:

On behalf of the Electric Safety and Reliability Branch (ESRB) of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), Rickey Tse of ESRB staff investigated an incident involving electrical contact between PG&E's Rossmoor 1104 12 kV circuit and Verizon's communication cable lash wire that resulted in a fire. The incident occurred on October 27, 2019 near the intersection of Pleasant Hill and Condit Road in Lafayette, California.

**General Order (GO) 95, Rule 18.A.(2): Resolution of Potential Violations of General Order 95 and Safety Hazards** states:

*"Where a communications company's or an electric utility's (Company A's) actions result in potential violations of GO 95 for another entity (Company B), that entity's (Company B's) remedial action will be to transmit a single documented notice of identified potential violations to the communications company or electric utility (Company A) within a reasonable amount of time not to exceed 180 days after the entity discovers the potential violations of GO 95. **If the potential violation constitutes a Safety Hazard, such notice shall be transmitted within ten (10) business days after the entity discovers the Safety Hazard.**" [Emphasis Added]*

ESRB's investigation determined that PG&E's conductors and Verizon's cable did not have the proper required vertical separation. After becoming aware of the clearance violation, PG&E failed to notify Verizon of the non-conformance and safety hazard in a timely manner. The clearance violation constitutes a safety hazard because it caused the incident, which resulted in a fire. PG&E is required to provide a third-party notification for violation that constitutes a safety hazard within ten business days after PG&E discovers the hazard. The incident occurred on October 27, 2019. However, PG&E did not notify Verizon until January 24, 2020, nearly three months after the incident occurred. Therefore, ESRB found PG&E in violation of GO 95, Rule

18.A.(2) for failing to provide a third-party notification to Verizon on the safety hazard within ten business days as required.

Please provide a response no later than May 4, 2020 by electronic or hard copy of all corrective actions and preventive measures taken by PG&E to remedy and prevent the recurrence of such a violation. If you have any questions concerning this NOV, please contact Rickey Tse at (415) 355-5581 or [Rickey.Tse@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Rickey.Tse@cpuc.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Banu Acimis".

Banu Acimis, P.E.  
Program and Project Supervisor  
Electric Safety and Reliability Branch  
Safety and Enforcement Division  
California Public Utilities Commission

Cc: Lee Palmer, Director, Safety and Enforcement Division, CPUC  
Nika Kjensli, Program Manager, ESRB, SED, CPUC  
Charlotte TerKeurst, ESRB, SED, CPUC  
Fadi Daye, Program and Project Supervisor, ESRB, SED, CPUC  
Rickey Tse, Senior Utilities Engineer (Supervisor), ESRB, SED, CPUC  
Nathan Sarina, Senior Utilities Engineer (Supervisor), ESRB, SED, CPUC