PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



December 31, 2013

Ross Johnson Associate Director – Regulatory AT&T California 525 Market Street, 19th Floor, #33 San Francisco, CA 94105 CA2013-009

SUBJECT: Audit of AT&T Wireless - LA County

Dear Mr. Johnson:

On behalf of the Electric Safety and Reliability Branch of the California Public Utilities Commission, Koko Tomassian of my staff conducted an audit of AT&T Wireless – LA County from August 19, 2013 to August 23, 2013. The audit included a review of AT&T Wireless' records and field inspections of AT&T Wireless' facilities.

During the audit, my staff identified violations of one or more General Orders (GOs). A copy of the audit summary itemizing the violations is enclosed. Please advise me no later than February 14, 2014, by electronic or hard copy, of all corrective measures taken by AT&T Wireless 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,

Raymond Fugere, P.E.

Program and Project Supervisor

Electric Safety and Reliability Branch

Safety and Enforcement Division

Enclosure: Audit Summary

CC: Elizaveta Malashenko, Deputy Director, Safety and Enforcement Division

Fadi Daye, Senior Utilities Engineer Supervisor, CPUC-LA

AUDIT SUMMARY

1.	Structure No.:	49-1-S15
	Previous AT&T Wireless Visit Details:	Patrol Inspection, October 2012
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	August 20, 2013

Explanation of Violation(s):

Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership

GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 8C, requires that:

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.

The vertical clearance between an AT&T Wireless cable and other CIP cables was less than 12 inches. This violation was not noted or addressed when AT&T last inspected the pole.

2.	Structure No.:	372273M
	Previous AT&T Wireless Visit Details:	Patrol Inspection, October 2012
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	August 20, 2013

Explanation of Violation(s):

Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership

GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 8C, requires that:

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.

The vertical clearance between an AT&T Wireless cable and other CIP cables was less than 12 inches. This violation was not noted or addressed when AT&T last inspected the pole.

3.	Structure No.:	324244M
	Previous AT&T Wireless Visit Details:	Patrol Inspection, October 2012
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	August 20, 2013

Explanation of Violation(s):

Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership

GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 8C, requires that:

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.

The vertical clearance between an AT&T Wireless cable and other CIP cables at midspan was less than 12 inches. This violation was not noted or addressed when AT&T last inspected the pole.

4.	Structure No.:	Two Poles West of 10063PBM
	Previous AT&T Wireless Visit Details:	Patrol Inspection, October 2012
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	August 20, 2013

Explanation of Violation(s):

Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership

GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 8C, requires that:

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.

The vertical clearance between an AT&T Wireless cable and other CIP cables at midspan was less than 12 inches. This violation was not noted or addressed when AT&T last inspected the pole.

5.	Structure No.:	742818	
	Previous AT&T Wireless Visit Details:	Patrol Inspection, October 2012	2
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	August 22, 2013	

Explanation of Violation(s):

Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership

GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 8C, requires that:

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.

The vertical clearance between an AT&T Wireless cable and other CIP cables at midspan was less than 12 inches. This violation was not noted or addressed when AT&T last inspected the pole.

6.	Structure No.:	1736526		
	Previous AT&T Wireless Visit Details:	Patrol Inspection, October 2012	16	0 9 7
	Date of CPUC Inspection:	August 22, 2013		

Explanation of Violation(s):

Insufficient Clearance Between Communication Cables of Different Ownership

GO 95, Rule 38, Table 2, Case 8C, requires that:

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.

The vertical clearance between an AT&T Wireless splice box and other CIP cables were less than 12 inches. This violation was not noted or addressed when AT&T last inspected the pole.