

Edward L. Clark, Jr.

#2

From: Edward L. Clark, Jr. [ed@theelectricalexpert.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2008 4:36 PM
To: 'mai@cpuc.ca.gov'
Cc: 'rst@cpuc.ca.gov'; 'rgf@cpuc.ca.gov'; 'ffd@cpuc.ca.gov'
Subject: San Diego County Wild fire
Attachments: Pole placement Witch Fire.jpg; Clarification GO-95 Rule 56.doc

Meeting Held 1/15/08 Mssrs.: Raffy Stepanian CPUC Ed Clark, The Electrical Expert, San Diego Fires
Mahmoud (Steve) Antabli, P.E. CPUC
Fadi Daye, P.E. CPUC
Raymond Fugere, P.E.

Meeting was called to review findings by Ed Clark regarding the San Diego Fires.
Following Introductions, Ed Clark reviewed his credentials, background, work experience and Education.
Ed Clark asked if any participants had previously designed or built a Utility Power Line? Anser NO

Acknowledged that this meeting was for information only from Ed Clark to the PUC due to an on going investigation by the PUC.

General discussion: Reviewed report published on the internet by Ed Clark on www.theelectricalexpert.com
Reviewed Ed Clarks position regarding the PUC GO-95 specifically rule 56, (see attachment)
General Discussion commenced regarding interpretations of rule 56.
Provided lab results for verification of carbon resulting from arcing.
Had dialogue regarding a variety of potential violations like : Loose Guy wires, Qualifications of SDG&E Engineers and their responsibility to ensure safe design.
Ed Clark reviewed why he felt the only way this problem gets resolved and fixed do to the liability to SDG&E is by going public to allow the regulators and others to oversee that it gets done and not allow SDG&E to defer do to other litigation,
Ed Clark outlined that the entire system needs to be inspected, corrected and evidence preserved as soon as possible to prevent more fires.

The meeting concluded with Ed Clark making himself available for a site visit or at anytime to answer questions.

OBSERVATION: I do appreciate the opportunity to meet and explain my findings to you. However, we are all have different backgrounds, so it is OK not to agree on an interpretation. With what is at stake for the communities in San Diego County I do need to share my frustration in a comment made that "technically, in your opinion, Rule 56D-2", the 3" rule is maintained by the distance of a bolt.

I just need to go on record with you, that this rule is for an **ELECTRICAL UTILITY**. You are all Electrical Engineers looking at an Electrical (NOT MECHANICAL) violation. We all agreed that guy wires on not supposed to come in contact to prevent circulating current. That is the reason for the 3"rule. Consequently, since a bolt was utilized to connect the two guy wires, there is ZERO Electrical distance. Consequently a violation.

It appears to me, (please don't take offense) that since you have not designed a power line before, this problem is new to you, you can only interpret based on the literal sense of the text. So with that in mind, I guess I can see how you are looking at this. Please look at the electrical interpretation of why the rule in in place. If possible go back and find who wrote the rule and have them review with you. I realize that sometimes especially when the exposure is so high to an entity, sometime we look for the Political Technicality (to be safe) rather than acknowledge a very basic error. As I indicated yesterday, if it is against the rules for them to come in contact, then it is agaisnt the rules for an Engineer to make contact intentionally through a metal object (a bolt).

One of the comments made yesterday was the responsibility of SDG&E to hace competent Engineers who understand what they are designing to protect the public. I am calling on you, (for the Public) for the same level of professionalism and interpret the rule as it is intended "For an Electrical Application in a High Voltage Electrical Utility". Anything less, well you see the consequences.

The rules are not vague, I recognized th problem immediately upon visiting the site and no other Utilitiy I am aware of has had this problem.

Per your request in our meeting yesterday, please refer to the attached map.

The red line you see between pole 416685 and 416686 is the fire line from the fire department for the witch fire.

The lab results provided to you were on pole 416686 from the 2003 Cedar Fire according to arson investigators.

I would start your investigation at pole 416686 and work your way back. Open up yellow covers so you can see carbon in side the covers. Also observe the ground rod that is in the ground and ask the question when was it installed and by who? What was the reason?. Note that it is next to the guy anchor.????

Next go to pole 416685. This was one of the locations the fire actually started.

Pole 416679 is the location shown in the slide show of the Fire starting as well.

This pole 416679 is the same general location that the property owner took us to and was the general location established as the point of origin. I of course am taking the position that the fire point of origin is multiple locations.

As you start at the beginning, observe all of the poles with this wrong design as far as you can drive, approx. every 3 or 4 poles.. The map attached is just a partial map, the farther you drive the more locations you can collect data and see what is going on.

You will need a 4-wheel drive truck. I would be happy to meet with you and show you around if needed.

Ed Clark