

## PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



August 24, 2012

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

EA2012-016

**SUBJECT:** Audit of SCE's Antelope Valley District

Dear Mr. LeMoine:

On behalf of the Electric Safety and Reliability Branch of the California Public Utilities Commission, Derek Fong, Koko Tomassian, and Richard Kyo of my staff conducted an audit of SCE's Antelope Valley District from June 18, 2012, to June 22, 2012. The audit included a review of SCE's records and field 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 28, 2012, by electronic or hard copy, of all corrective measures taken by SCE to remedy and prevent such violations.

If you have any questions concerning this audit, you can contact Derek Fong at (213) 576-6850 or [derek.fong@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:derek.fong@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  
John Deng, Technical Specialist 3, SCE, Santa Ana

## AUDIT SUMMARY

<b>1.</b>	<b>Location:</b>	Antelope Valley District
	<b>Date of CPUC Inspection:</b>	06/18/2012
<b>Explanation of Violation(s):</b>		
<b><u>Late Work Orders</u></b>		
<p>GO 165, Section IV, Standards for Inspection, Record-keeping, and Reporting, States in part:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“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.”</i></p> <p>Your records indicated that from 2009 to 2011, 266 work orders were completed late. Additionally, in 2012, there were 290 open/past due work orders.</p>		
<b>2.</b>	<b>Location:</b>	Pole No. 2322387E
	<b>Previous SCE Visit Details:</b>	01/12/2012
	<b>Date of CPUC Inspection:</b>	06/18/2012
<b>Explanation of Violation(s):</b>		
<b><u>Inadequate Clearance between SCE Triplex Cable and Street Lamp</u></b>		
<p>GO 95, Rule 37, Minimum Clearances of Wires above Railroads, Thoroughfares, Buildings, Etc., States in part:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“...the clearances between conductors, guys, messengers or trolley span wires and buildings, poles, structures, or other objects, shall not be less than those set forth in Table 1, at a temperature of 60 F and no wind.”</i></p> <p>An SCE triplex cable and a street lamp were almost touching. This violation was not documented when SCE last inspected the pole.</p>		

<b>3.</b>	<b>Location:</b>	Pole No. 2337705E
	<b>Previous SCE Visit Details:</b>	01/12/2012
	<b>Date of CPUC Inspection:</b>	06/18/2012
<b>Explanation of Violation(s):</b>		
<b><u>Inadequate Clearance between SCE guy wire and Communications Cable</u></b>		
GO 95, Rule 56.4-C4, Overhead Guys, Anchor Guys and Span Wires, States:		
<i>“The radial clearances between guys and conductors supported by or attached to the same poles or crossarms shall not be less than as specified in Table 2, Case 19.”</i>		
An SCE guy wire and a communications cable had less than a 3 inch radial clearance as required in Table 2, Case 19, Column C. This violation was not documented when SCE last inspected the pole.		

<b>4.</b>	<b>Location:</b>	Pole No. 4628170E
	<b>Previous SCE Visit Details:</b>	01/12/2012
	<b>Date of CPUC Inspection:</b>	06/18/2012
<b>Explanation of Violation(s):</b>		
<b><u>Abandoned SCE Guy Wire</u></b>		
GO 95, Rule 31.6, Abandoned Lines, States:		
<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.”</i>		
The pole supported an SCE guy wire that was abandoned. This violation was not documented when SCE last inspected the pole.		

<b>5.</b>	<b>Location:</b>	Pole No. 1769552E
	<b>Previous SCE Visit Details:</b>	02/03/2012
	<b>Date of CPUC Inspection:</b>	06/19/2012
<b>Explanation of Violation(s):</b>		
<b><u>Pole Steps</u></b>		
GO 95, Rule 91.3-A1, Stepping, States:		
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>“Poles with Vertical Runs or Risers: 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>		
This jointly-used pole supported supply conductors and a vertical run but was not provided with pole steps. This violation was not documented when SCE last inspected the pole.		

<b>6.</b>	<b>Location:</b>	Pole No. 1897798E
	<b>Previous SCE Visit Details:</b>	02/06/2012
	<b>Date of CPUC Inspection:</b>	06/19/2012
<b>Explanation of Violation(s):</b>		
<b><u>Loose Guy Wire</u></b>		
GO 95, Rule 56.2, Overhead Guys, Anchor Guys and Span Wires, States:		
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>“Guys shall be attached to structures, as nearly as practicable, at the center of load. They shall be maintained taut and of such strength as to meet the safety factors of Rule 44.”</i></p>		
The pole supported an SCE guy wire that was not taut. This violation was not documented when SCE last inspected the pole.		