

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



April 29, 2014

Redacted

Senior Safety Specialist

Redacted

Re: Safety Violations Discovered February 4, 2014

Dear Redacted:

The CPUC Inspector finds that PG&E's Spaulding Management is in violation of safe tram operation.

As a result of an injury accident on November 15, 2013, the CPUC Inspector performed a joint inspection of the tram and tramway on February 4, 2014 with a representative from Cal-OSHA.

The CPUC Inspector found the following violations:

- 1) At the time of the accident the tram was "overloaded" with personnel and equipment¹. This overloaded situation could reoccur since the Tram Operating Procedure does not specifically give authority to anyone to enforce load restrictions or proper behavior on the tram.
- 2) The injured employee was allowed to sit in an unsafe manner and at a location that was not a designated passenger seat (abated).
- 3) Safety signage on the tram was not present (abated). This has been abated but still lacks OSHA compliance.
- 4) There was no guard rail on the tram car to protect workers from fall hazards. There was an attempt to abate this, but the guard rail is still not Cal-OSHA compliant.²
- 5) The upper tram loading platforms are missing guard rails.
- 6) Safety orientation lacks emphasis on rider safety and behavior.
- 7) Tram operators are not required to document daily equipment inspections. This written component should be part of the tram operating procedures.
- 8) Management was ignoring and tolerating employee behavior leading to complacency and the acceptance of unsafe working conditions.³
- 9) The Employee's training records showed that required annual recertification training such as CPR or the use of AED's (among others) are not being performed.
- 10) Tram operator proficiency is not clearly tracked.

¹ PG&E Location Drawing

² OSHA Standard T8-3210 (b)

³ OSHA Standard T8-3203 a(4)

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

- 11) The tram car surface continues to pose a significant slip and fall hazard. The angle of the tram car is significant and under wet or icy conditions the wooden floor can be very slick and hazardous.
- 12) Employees are expected to perform routine snow removal tasks exposing them to heights of 14 feet without proper fall protection.
- 13) Annual fire drills have not been performed for the facilities in violation of NFPA Standards.⁴
- 14) There are no "Tram" specific emergency rescue procedures.
- 15) Contingencies are not in place; such as emergency extrication, evacuation or sheltering in place for seismic or fire emergencies where the tram, stairs or trail become unavailable due to instability or inaccessibility.
- 16) The Tram does not meet industry standards for safety.⁵ For example:
 - The tram car does not have any emergency braking system
 - There is no runaway arrest mechanism for the unlikely event of cable separation
 - There is no safe emergency egress from the tram car
 - The tram car has no auxiliary power unit or winch to convey passengers to safety in the case of controller failure, power loss or primary motor failure

Please submit a written Corrective Action Plan by May 30, 2014, which describes how Management has addressed or plans to address these violations with completion dates. If you have any questions or need an extension of time, please contact me by email or at 916-835-7448.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James T. Cheng", written over a large, light-colored oval shape.

James T. Cheng, Utilities Engineer
Safety and Enforcement Division

⁴ NFPA 30 4.5.6.2

⁵ ANSI Standard B77.1-2011 & B77.1a-2012