

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



January 14, 2009

Sacramento Municipal Utilities District
Mail Stop E204
1708 – 59th Street,
Sacramento, CA 95819-4628
Attn: Ron Saufferer
Director of Distribution Services

CPUC File No: E2008-10

SUBJECT: Electric Audit (GO95/128/165) Audit of the Sacramento Municipal Utilities District (SMUD)

On behalf of the Utilities Safety and Reliability Branch of the California Public Utilities Commission, Julian Ajello and I conducted an Electric Audit of SMUD from 9/8/08 to 9/12/08. The audit included a review of GO165 inspection records and field inspections of the overhead and padmount distribution facilities.

During the inspection, we identified violations of one or more General Orders. A copy of the audit summary itemizing the violations is enclosed. Please advise me of all corrective measures taken by the Utility regarding the attached violations within 120 days of receiving this letter. Please provide the electronic or hard copy records showing the correction date for each violation or the action plan for correction of each violation.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (415) 703-1817.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Paul Penney".

Paul Penney
Utilities Engineer
Utilities Safety and Reliability Branch
Consumer Protection and Safety Division

Enclosure: Appendix A

- (1) GO165 Records Review
- (2) GO95/128 Field Notes
- (3) Concerns
- (4) Recommendations

CC: Sacramento Municipal Utilities District
Mail Stop E204
1708 – 59th Street,
Sacramento, CA 95819-4628
Attn: Harry Marks
Maria Veloso-Koenig

APPENDIX A

(1) GO165 Records Review

The last paragraph of GO165, Section IV (Standards for Inspection, Record Keeping, and Reporting) states:

“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...:[Underline Added]”

In response to CPUC data request #1, question #2, SMUD indicated that “...The areas shown in white have been inspected but are not color coded due to incomplete documentation.” Although SMUD has inspected the facilities within five years as required by the table in GO165, the documentation is incomplete. SMUD is, therefore, in violation of this paragraph for each of the grid areas color coded on the map in white.

(2) GO95/GO128 Inspection Field Notes

The field portion of the audit was conducted from September 10—12, 2008. Recently completed and open tags were examined. The following issues were identified during the field verifications of the tags. Please identify what actions SMUD has taken or will take with regard to these items:

- (1) Notification #: 30308983 (1329 Watt Ave.); this was a completed tag that had a split/ broken crossarm. The repair appeared to be incomplete.
- (2) Notification #: 30303427 (9221 Parfait Dr.); this was an incomplete tag that had a bush growing inside the padmount transformer, with evidence of oil leakage. We believe the removal of the bush and repair/ replacement of the transformer should be expedited.

The field audit also consisted of examining recently completed detailed inspections of padmount and overhead facilities on maps 382/203 and 382/206; the SMUD contractor inspected the facilities between 7/31/08 to 8/27/08, and we conducted our inspection on 9/12/08. Please see the itemized listing of violations found during our field review of these facilities. The listing identifies the specific pole number, GO95 or GO128 rule citation and field observation.

SMUD explained during the audit that the contractor fixes certain items below 10 feet during the detailed inspections, and documents the remainder of the GO infractions that are then added to SMUD’s database. SMUD also indicated that they do a 10% QA audit of the contractor’s inspected facilities.

Our findings from the inspection on September 9, 2008 were compared to field observations generated by SMUD’s contractor during the detailed inspection process for maps 382/203 and 382/206. We found GO95 violations during our review that were not noted on the contractors field notes. These violations are highlighted in yellow on the field notes. While some of these violations may have occurred between the time of the contractors inspection and the time we did our inspection, we believe several GO95 violations were most likely present during the time the contractor did their inspection. For example, several violations we found were related to exposed ground wires.

Does SMUD provide feedback to the contractor to correct deficiencies found from SMUD's QA check? Please describe that process.

(3) Concerns

- (a) During the records review, SMUD provided one SAP printout¹ showing numerous tags where the "complete dates" exceeded the priority set, especially in cases where the priority was identified as urgent. If the priorities are, indeed, an accurate evaluation of the abnormal condition, then SMUD should strive to ensure that repairs are made per the priorities made during the evaluation process.
- (b) During the field portion of the audit, we noted at least one location where the ground wire was uncovered, and had a significant amount of slack on it (Pole # UD054810). If this/ these ground wires have already been repaired, why did they have this slack (i.e. were they disconnected from the ground rod, or the equipment being protected, or some other reason)?

(4) Recommendations

- (a) An SAP printout showed "Complete Dates" that were before the "Notification Dates." If "Notification Date" refers to the date the non-compliance was found during the inspection, then SMUD should fix the glitch in SAP.

¹ The printout was for "down guy broken/split.