

## **Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3  
San Dimas, CA 91773  
Phone (909) 592-4001  
Fax (909) 592-4636

January 21, 2004

A regular meeting of the **Administrative Board** took place on the above date, at 9:00 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Ernie Solorzano	Southern California Edison
Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena
Mr. Doug Schmaderer	City of Pasadena
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Tina Taylor	Sprint PCS
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS
Ms. Velma Prouty	SBC Pacific Bell
Mr. Robert Allen	City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Paula Haney	Verizon California
Ms. Kathleen Dell	AT&T Wireless
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff
Mr. Tony Rabe	SBC Pacific Bell (via conference call)

Guests:	Mr. Robert J. Rogers	Sprint LD
	Mr. Matthew Bacon	Sprint LD
	Mr. Mike Bogner	Sprint LD

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Ms. Prouty called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. She allowed for introductions.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Ms. Prouty asked the members to review the minutes of the December 17, 2003 Board meeting. After the members reviewed the minutes, Ms. Prouty inquired if there were any corrections, additions or deletions to the minutes. There being no additions, corrections, or deletions, Ms. Prouty asked for a motion of approval. Ms. Dell motioned to approve the December 17, 2003 minutes as written. Ms. Haney seconded the motion, which upon voting, was approved unanimously.

## **MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the gross operating expenses for December 2003 totaled \$85,545.78. The members were assessed the above referenced amount. She stated that December reflects an above average month. This is due to the initial payment of \$37,500.00 to Hyperlink on the contract signed on November 4, 2003. The contract is for the cleaning of records in the current Clipper database, and the completion of Forms 2, 7, and 48.

## **COMMUNICATIONS:**

Ms. Corella then reported on the current **iPole status**. The timeline for the above mentioned contract is for 90 days, therefore, Hyperlink should be complete with the contract specifications by February 4, 2004. Ms. Corella stated that she has sent an email to the members soliciting any concerns that they may have in regards to the iPole presentation. She further reported that she has received a response from AT&T Wireless. Ms. Dell added that what she would like to view, is the JPA process from initial step to completion, and the final JPA printed.

Next, Ms. Corella reported that she has responded via letter to the 90-day extension requests of **PG&E, City of Vernon, and City of Banning**. She further reported that included in the letter was the statement that the members would be reinstated to their original membership date. This is an important issue in that certain sections of the Routine Handbook allude to membership date. She stated that she had agreement from the Operating and Reorganization committee on that decision. Ms. Goetz suggested inserting a footnote in Section 20 of the Routine Handbook reflecting the date of their membership reinstatement. Mr. Solorzano inquired if Ms. Corella quoted a reinstatement fee in the correspondence to the above-mentioned members. Ms. Corella responded that she did mention a monetary quote. She stated that the members had discussed the membership fee, and the consensus, at the time of discussion, was to calculate what each members assessment fee would have been had they opted to remain in the Committee from the date of the 1998 Agreement to December 2003. Ms. Corella reported that she calculated (based on percentage of non-usable footage) a monthly assessment and multiplied it by 60 months (five years 1998-2003). Ms. Dell inquired if the members had discussed what would be done with the reinstatement monies, should the former members opt to membership again. Ms. Corella responded that the members have not discussed that issue, however, as is done with new membership fees, the monies would be credited to the current members toward their monthly assessment fees.

Lastly, Ms. Corella reported the Altrio status. She stated that at the previous meeting, she shared an email received from Mr. Wayment with the present members. In the email Mr. Wayment stated that he is no longer with Altrio. Ms. Corella reported that she contacted Altrio Communications and inquired about Mr. Wayment's replacement, and the relationship between Altrio and the Committee. She was connected to Mr. Doug Landaker. She questioned Mr. Landaker about the current financial standing of Altrio. Mr. Landaker replied that Altrio has downsized

its workforce from 250 to 35. He further notified Ms. Corella that Altrio is up for sale. Ms. Corella informed Mr. Landaker that she would be sending a correspondence inquiring about the future of the relationship between Altrio and the Committee. Mr. Landaker assured Ms. Corella that he would see to it that the letter gets to one of Altrio's CEO's. Mr. Landaker can be reached at Altrio at (323) 908-1300 Ex 1363. Ms. Corella will keep the members posted on any further action from Altrio Communications. Mr. Cox inquired what members should do with Altrio JPAs. Ms. Dell suggested finalizing their JPAs, in the event that they may file bankruptcy. Ms. Prescott disagreed, stating that Altrio has not filed bankruptcy yet, and should they file, and the JPAs are in prior to the petition date, when the bankruptcy is settled and creditors are paid, they will receive a percentage to the dollar. However, if you bill post-petition date and they are purchased by another entity, the purchasing entity would be required to pay the post-petition debts in its entirety. Ms. Prescott further stated that this would have to be a business decision by each member, and their organization's legal department.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

### Item 1357: Sprint Membership Application Interview

Ms. Corella distributed the questionnaire, which was mailed to, and returned by Sprint (see attached).

The Sprint representatives introduced themselves. The three reps are Mr. Matthew Bacon, Mr. Mike Bogner, and Mr. R.J. Rogers. Mr. Bacon initiated the interview. He reported the reasons for their interest in membership is to provide a more direct access for their customers, as well as to reduce their access costs. Mr. Bacon further stated that historically, the access for their customers was underground construction. However, underground construction is very costly, and as all other communication organizations today, resources are limited. They became aware of the Committee from the PCS side of their organization. He stated that today, the gap between the PCS and LD is closing, as far as resources are concerned. Mr. Bogner reported that they plan on doing no more than 250 poles a year for the next two to three years. This should give the members an idea of the expected volume of work. He further reported that Sprint LD chose ownership versus leasing, and that it was their legal department that chose to separate the LD from the PCS. Ms. Dell inquired about their active participation within the Committee. She stressed that attendance is important and beneficial to members. Mr. Rogers reported that the representatives for Sprint LD would be either Mr. Matthew Bacon, or Mr. Tibor Lakey. Mr. Bacon stated that they would be committed to the responsibilities of Committee participation.

Mr. Solorzano stated that the members have authorized inspection programs ongoing, and that all owners must share in the inspection costs. The representatives responded that they are aware of this issue. Mr. Solorzano inquired if they have any completed JPAs ready to submit as soon as they are approved. Mr. Bogner responded that there are some JPAs, however, they are not complete. The members discussed the issue of pole loading required calculations. Ms. Dell stated that it is the responsibility of each member to ensure that wind-loading calculations have been done.

The members thanked Mr. Bacon, Mr. Rogers and Mr. Bogner for their time, and informed them that upon their return in February 2004, the members would discuss and decide on their membership application.

## **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

### **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements**

Chairman, Mr. Solorzano reported that Authorized Costs did not meet in December. However, did meet in January 2004 (please refer to the minutes for further details).

### **Operating Committee**

Ms. Prouty reported that Operating Committee did not meet in December.

### **ad hoc Committee on Reorganization**

Chairperson, Ms. Prouty reported that Reorganization did not meet in December.

### **Routine Revision Committee**

Chairperson, Ms. Prescott reported that Routine Revision did not meet in December, but had met in January 2004 (please refer to the minutes for further details).

## **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

**Item 1330: Revised 2002 Steel Prices**

**Item 1350: 2004 Pole Prices**

Ms. Dell motioned to move the items on Consent to Discussion. Mr. Brown seconded the motion.

## **DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

**Item 1350: 2004 Pole Prices**

Ms. Dell stated that the costs have increased by a substantial percentage. Mr. Solorzano responded that the loaded labor rate, and labor costs have increased. Mr. Allen stated that his labor hours have increased, and that he has verified within his organization to ensure that the hours are correct. Ms. Dell stated that it appears that the members are reflecting their pole prices from different perspectives.

Mr. Solorzano stated that at the last meeting Mr. Rabe had presented the method utilized by the NCJPA in determining pole prices. He further stated that the members had agreed, moving forward, the members would scrutinize the components used to arrive at pole costs, and that the 2004 proposed costs would remain. Ms. Prouty stated after the previous meeting, SBC reviewed the 2004 proposed costs, and after some reconsideration, decided that SBC was not satisfied with the proposed costs and would not accept them. Mr. Rabe added that the issue is how the loaded labor rate is compiled. Mr. Rabe referred to the term "cost recovery", which in his opinion, utilities are looking to recover all costs on the work that has been performed. He further stated that this is the method utilized by PG&E, and perhaps the SCJPC as well. Mr. Rabe stated that SCE has stated in the past that they would like to be made whole. Mr. Solorzano responded that the statement has been taken out of context. The true costs of placing poles are greater than the costs submitted by SCE. The components used for establishing costs, is for the work that is considered mutually beneficial to all members, and the additional components are considered costs of doing business for SCE. Mr. Rabe reiterated that the members must look at mutual components with the same perspective. Mr. Solorzano questioned Mr. Rabe if SBC would provide the components and elements used by the NCJPA and SBC to arrive at pole costs. Mr. Rabe responded that he would forward the information to the SCJPC office for distribution to the members. Mr. Solorzano stated that another issue that requires discussion, is that other members participate in the pole inspection programs, to which SCE is mandated to perform, and familiarize themselves with GO 165. Mr. Rabe responded that SBC would contract this sort of work, and has capabilities of obtaining low rates. Mr. Allen questioned if Mr. Rabe has any questions in how DWP arrives at pole costs, since Mr. Allen has provided Ms. Prouty with the documentation. Mr. Rabe responded that he has not reviewed the documents. Mr. Allen questioned Mr. Rabe if the decision to remove SBC from the pole-replacing program was a corporate decision. Mr. Rabe responded that it was, because it is viewed as taking work from an IBEW member. Mr. Solorzano stated Mr. Rabe mentioned that the north resists SBC's idea of pole placing, and asked whom he approached within SCE. He responded that he has not approached anyone at this time. Mr. Solorzano stated that a meeting to discuss this issue should be scheduled. Mr. Rabe stated that if SBC participates in a pole placing program it would be limited, to which type of pole situations SBC would handle. The program would utilize SBC and SCE resources. SBC would pick their locations, because of GO 165, and this would be a learning curve for SBC. If SBC picks and chooses locations, this would generate additional costs. Mr. Solorzano questioned Mr. Rabe that when calculating pole costs, if the components and costs used by SBC are those costs they would incur if they were in a pole-placing program. Mr. Rabe responded that the rates used by SBC are the direct rates for technicians. Mr. Solorzano interjected that the techs are not qualified electrical workers, therefore, why would SBC use these rates. Mr. Rabe responded that they are qualified technicians by definition. Mr. Solorzano responded that he could assume that the techs are qualified to handle all electrical situations. Mr. Rabe reiterated that by definition they can handle these situations, however, in reality they are not. Ms. Dell stated that from her experience with the communication companies, they have been placing poles for many years, and have the capabilities to handle power space. Mr. Rabe agreed with Ms. Dell, however, he further stated that methods have changed to allow the power to handle their equipment. Mr. Solorzano added that in reviewing the spreadsheet that reflects

how many poles have been set within the last five years, by members that submit pole prices, SBC has set 89 fifty foot poles, and Verizon has set 55 of such poles. It appears to Mr. Solorzano that communications has set a small percentage of poles in regards to SCE in the last five years. If SBC contracts linemen, or uses in house linemen, to work on the pole placement program, SCE will need to review the documents and methods that qualify such linemen to convince Local 47 that the linemen are qualified. Mr. Rabe questioned Mr. Solorzano if the work performed by linemen is followed up with an inspection to ascertain that the work has been performed correctly. Mr. Solorzano responded positive. Mr. Allen stated that according to his local, all linemen must be qualified to handle all situations and complete the entire construction. Mr. Solorzano stated that SCE and SBC would need to meet to discuss the issue of SBC engaging in a pole inspection/setting program. Ms. Rabe stated that in each situation, the utilities would need agreement, if the decision were to allow SBC to replace/place a pole, to decide if SBC has the resources to handle the construction. Mr. Solorzano responded that, for the sake of equity, SBC should not be allowed to choose which pole placing scenarios it chooses to undertake. Mr. Rabe responded that SCE has stated if SBC could set a pole, more cost effectively than SCE, than SBC should move forward. Mr. Solorzano stated that the 2004 prices remain suspended, pending on the above-mentioned discussion, and in his opinion, they are two separate issues. Mr. Solorzano stated that in the past SBC was comfortable with the costs, and costs were not an issue. Mr. Solorzano questioned why the pole prices are an issue today. Mr. Rabe responded that the first issue is that there appears to be a change in how the SCJPC arrives at their costs, especially the elements and components being used. The second issue is that within the last five years the cost of poles has increased dramatically. The members agreed to arrange a meeting among them to discuss this issue further. This issue will be moved back to the ad hoc Authorized Costs Committee for further discussion.

**Item 1330: Revised 2002 Steel Prices– Authorized Costs**

SBC is not satisfied with this item; therefore, it will be moved back to the ad hoc Authorized Costs Committee for further discussion.

**Item 1350: 2004 Pole Prices – Authorized Costs**

SBC reported that it does not agree with the proposed 6% increase, and would like to move this item back to the ad hoc Authorized Costs Committee for further discussion. Mr. Solorzano reported that the ad hoc Committee was recommending this percentage for discussion only. Ms. Dell stated that historically the members have increased the entire Authorized Costs by a percentage. However, in her opinion, the Authorized Costs should be reviewed item by item by the members. Ms. Corella stated that she had emailed the entire Board soliciting input if any members have an issue with the Authorized Costs as they stand today. Mr. Solorzano stated that the members of the ad hoc Committee had agreed on the 6% suggested increase. Ms. Prouty responded that SBC was not in agreement with the proposed increase. Mr. Rabe stated that by increasing the Authorized cost by a percentage every two years is an overly simplified approach at escalating prices with

no control, and the long term effect will have an impact. Mr. Rabe stated that he speaks from past experience. Mr. Solorzano responded that he is in agreement with Mr. Rabe, but if the Committee agrees to review Authorized Costs by item, this would require more participation, and effort from all other members. He further stated that historically, participation has been limited. Mr. Solorzano further stated that if any members fail to attend meetings, then, by default they agree to the approved costs. This item will be moved back to the ad hoc Committee.

The members then discussed the proposed Authorized Costs that SCE recommended at the last ad hoc meeting. The members of the ad hoc were to review the proposals, and discuss them further at the following ad hoc meeting. Mr. Solorzano inquired if any members had a concern with the proposals. The members responded that they would like to review and discuss the proposals further. Ms. Hernandez commented on **Item 1334: Visibility Strips**. She stated that previously, she opposed it because it is not a GO 95 requirement. She further stated that she was instructed in her early JPA days, that the applying of viz strips is the sole responsibility of each individual utility. Mr. Solorzano responded that this operation is part of the inspection program, and to remain in compliance with safety requirements, the inspecting utility must attach viz strips, which are beneficial to all joint members. Ms. Solorzano stated that the volume of poles SCE inspects versus other members is substantially greater, therefore, his costs are greater.

The members agreed that the proposed costs would be discussed at the next ad hoc meeting. Mr. Solorzano would contact Ms. Corella, after checking his calendar, for a date to have the ad hoc Committee meet and discuss the proposed Authorized Costs.

#### **Benefit of inspection information on SCJPC database pole records.**

Ms. Corella opened the discussion by stating that the additional work submitted by Edison for their inspection JPAs may possibly create a backlog of JPA monthly processing. The question is how many members need the inspection information on the pole records. Ms. Hernandez stated that the information is necessary in the event that a pole is inspected within the allotted timeframe a second time, the joint members are entitled to reimbursement. She further stated that some poles are inspected by two utilities within the allotted time frame, and again joint members are billed twice. Therefore, Ms. Hernandez is of the opinion that pole inspection information is valuable and of benefit to joint owner. The members discussed this issue and it was agreed that inspection information is necessary.

#### **Benefit of Retag information on SCJPC database pole records.**

The members discussed this issue, and it agreed that pole-retagging information is not required on SCJPC pole records. This is due to the fact that pole tags can be taken from poles at any time, and it has been agreed that it is the responsibility of the inspecting utility to retag poles.

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1259: Approved Contractor List – ROUTINE REVISION
- Item 1280: Authorized Signatures – RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1330: Revised 2002 Steel Prices- AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1332: DWP Multi Member Codes – OPERATING
- Item 1334: Visibility Strips - ROUTINE REVISION
- Item 1341: Storm Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1342: Tennis Shoes on Wires - ROUTINE REVISION
- Item 1343: Routine Revision – ROUTINE REVISION
- Item 1345: New Member JPA Volume - RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1346: iPole Sharing with NCJPC - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1347: New Member Application Process - RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1349: Review Initial Membership Fee - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1350: 2004 Pole Prices - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1351: 2004 Authorized Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1355: JPC Property Rights Protection - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1356: Review of By-Laws - RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1357: Sprint LD Membership Application - OPERATING COMMITTEE

There was no discussion on unfinished business items. The above items remain open.

**Open Administrative Board Items**

Item 1339– *Environmental Issues*

This item remains open as an ongoing issue to ensure the Committee addresses any necessary environmental issues.

**New Business**

***Known Items:***

There were no known items to report.

***Unknown Items:***

There were no unknown items to report.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Authorized Costs			To Be Announced
Routine Revision	02/10/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Administrative Board	02/18/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	02/18/04	Following	Administrative Board
ReOrganization	02/18/04	Following	Operating Committee

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Prouty adjourned the meeting at 12:40 p.m., until February 18, 2004.

---

Ms. Velma Prouty, President

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

## Southern California Joint Pole Committee

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3  
 San Dimas, CA 91773  
 Phone (909) 592-4001  
 Fax (909) 592-4636

December 24, 2003

Michael J. Rutledge-Real Estate Negotiator  
 Mailstop: KSOPHHK0210-2A600  
 Sprint Communications Company L.P.  
 6100 Sprint Parkway  
 Overland Park, KS 66251

Dear Mr. Rutledge,

The Committee office has received your application fee, initial membership fee, and the requested information on your organization. Following are a list of inquiries that would assist the Committee in determining your needs, and membership consideration. Please read the questions, answer them to the best of your knowledge, and return to us as soon as possible. If needed, use additional sheets to answer questions.

What is your projected service territory?	The entire SCJPC territory.
What type and size of facilities will you be placing on poles?	Communication strand and Fiber Optic Cable
Will any facilities conflict with those existing already on poles?	Possible conflicts to be kept to a minimum. Sprint has experienced engineers on staff to deal with any conflicts or issues that may arise.
Who will do the placement and maintenance of facilities?	Sprint uses private contractors to do placement and some maintenance work on its facilities. Sprint can coordinate usage of contractors on its list that correspond to an approved SCJPC list, if there is one. Sprint would only be able to disclose its list of approved contractors subject to a prior non-disclosure agreement between the SCJPC and its members and Sprint.

ADELPHIA COMMUNICATIONS  
 ALTRIO COMMUNICATIONS INC.  
 AT&T BROADBAND (MEDIAONE)  
 AT&T COMM. OF CALIF., INC.  
 AT&T LOCAL SERV/TCG  
 AT&T WIRELESS  
 CINGULAR WIRELESS (PBW)

CITY OF COLTON  
 CITY OF GLENDALE  
 CITY OF LOMPOC  
 CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
 CITY OF PASADENA  
 CITY OF RIVERSIDE  
 ICG COMMUNICATIONS

NEXTG NETWORKS OF CALIFORNIA  
 SBC PACIFIC BELL  
 SOUTHERN CALIF. EDISON CO.  
 SOUTHERN CALIF. WATER CO.  
 SPRINT PCS  
 VERIZON CALIFORNIA, INC.  
 VERIZON WIRELESS

<p>Who will dispatch emergency response?</p>	<p>Tibor Laky          Sprint Area Cable Project Engineer          1350 W. Lambert Road          Brea, CA 92821- 2802          (714) 781- 7051</p>
<p>How is business being done currently without membership in the Committee?</p>	<p>All existing Sprint facilities within the SCJPC area are underground in private and public rights of way.</p>
<p>Who will administer the joint pole process? Are you aware of the administrative intensity and longevity of the process?</p>	<p>Sprint Transactions and Project Services will have responsibility for the agreement, payments and credits.</p> <p>Michael Rutledge is the initial contact. Although the contact and department may change in the future (with notice provided), this address will remain the same:</p> <p>Sprint Communications Company L.P.          Attn: TAPS – Carrier Contract Services          Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2040          6391 Sprint Parkway          Overland Park, KS 66251-2040          913-315-4863 (This number is subject to change)</p> <p>Tibor Laky and Matt Bacon will administer the technical and engineering issues. They are located in the Los Angeles metropolitan area.</p> <p>Sprint Communications Company L.P.          Attn: Tibor Laky or Matt Bacon          1350 W. Lambert Rd          Brea, CA 92821-2802          714-781-7051</p>
<p>Please be aware that new members replacing poles have a greater financial burden than do members who have 20 years of membership. Please respond.</p>	<p>Sprint understands its financial responsibility with membership in the SCPC.</p>
<p>What is the anticipated number of poles/JPAS you plan on submitting on a monthly basis?</p>	<p>Sprint anticipates an initial submission for approximately 0-250 poles. Sprint is unlikely to require poles on a monthly basis. Its needs will correspond to projects or relocations on an as-needed basis.</p>

Please feel free to contact me with any questions, or concerns at (909) 592-4001 Ext.12.

Sincerely,

Jennie Corella  
Office Manager

## Southern California Joint Pole Committee

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3  
San Dimas, CA 91773  
Phone (909) 592-4001  
Fax (909) 592-4636

February 18, 2004

A regular meeting of the **Administrative Board** took place on the above date, at 9:00 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Ernie Solorzano	Southern California Edison
Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Doug Schmaderer	City of Pasadena
Mr. Mahendra Garg	City of Anaheim
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Tina Taylor	Sprint PCS
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS
Ms. Velma Prouty	SBC Pacific Bell
Mr. Robert Allen	City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Paula Haney	Verizon California
Ms. Kathleen Dell	AT&T Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff
Mr. Tony Rabe	SBC Pacific Bell

Guests:	Mr. Sam Stonerock	Southern California Edison
	Mr. Chuck Weber	Southern California Edison
	Mr. Bob Robinson	Southern California Edison

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Ms. Dell called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Ms. Dell extended her gratitude to Ms. Prouty, and Mr. Allen for their service as Committee President, and Vice- President respectively for the 2003 year. She then allowed for introductions.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Ms. Dell asked the members to review the minutes of the January 21, 2004 Board meeting. After the members reviewed the minutes, Ms. Dell inquired if there were any corrections, additions or deletions to the minutes. There being no additions, corrections, or deletions, Ms. Dell asked for a motion of approval. Mr. Allen motioned to approve the January 21, 2004 minutes as written. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which upon voting, passed unanimously.

## **MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the gross operating expenses for January 2004 totaled \$42,924.71. The members were assessed the above referenced amount. She stated that January reflects an average month.

## **COMMUNICATIONS:**

Ms. Corella then reported on the current **iPole status**. She stated that Mr. Atalla held a two-week training session with the member's front line users. These sessions proved beneficial in that Mr. Atalla was able to identify bugs and minor enhancements. Mr. Corella reported that she would distribute pre-release iPole CDs to the members at the request of Mr. Atalla. He would like the members to install the CDs and familiarize themselves with the software, and note any suggested improvements.

Next, Ms. Corella reported that **Altrio Communications** has received five bids from outside entities interested in purchasing Altrio. Altrio has accepted one offer, and is in the process of sale transition. Ms. Corella was contacted by Mr. Peter Sullivan of Argus Management, a consulting company based out of Boston, Massachusetts, who is here working with Altrio Communications to assist and expedite the closing of the sale. Mr. Sullivan stated that Mr. Landaker of Altrio Communications, recommended that he contact Ms. Corella to report on the status of the sale. Mr. Sullivan reported that the new owners would acquire all assets and liabilities. They would like to continue with the Altrio network, and pick up with business as usual. Therefore, it appears that Altrio Communications need not file bankruptcy. Ms. Corella reiterated that this is all the information Mr. Sullivan disclosed. She thanked Mr. Sullivan for contacting her and sharing this information, which allows her to share it with the members. Ms. Corella then shared Mr. Sullivan's phone number (617) 803-8775 with the members should they choose to contact him.

Ms. Corella reported that she was contacted by Mr. Lugo of **City of Vernon**, expressing their continued interest in membership reinstatement. Mr. Lugo stated that this issue is slated for City Council. Mr. Lugo is collecting relevant information to take to the next city council meeting. He stressed that the decision on membership reinstatement is based on the city council.

Lastly, Ms. Corella reported on her appointment with the intellectual property rights lawyer, Mr. Thomas Daly. This issue pertains to **Item 1355: JPC Property Rights Protection**. Ms. Corella briefed those members unfamiliar with this issue. The Operating Committee has contemplated obtaining copyrights to the Routine Handbook, the iPole software, and the concept of the Committee and how it operates. In regards to the idea/concept of the JPC, the law allows one year to patent an idea, and the idea is not publicly known. In the case of the JPC concept, the time has expired, and the Committee is well known. However, the Routine

Handbook, and the iPole software can be copyright protected. Ms. Corella reported that this item would be discussed further at the next Operating Meeting.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

There were no special reports.

## **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

### **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements**

Chairman, Mr. Solorzano reported that Authorized Costs did not meet in January.

### **Operating Committee**

Chairman, Mr. Brown reported that Operating Committee did meet in January. Mr. Brown reported that Mr. Carlos Alvarado has been terminated, and had been on disciplinary action.

### **ad hoc Committee on Reorganization**

Chairperson, Ms. Prouty reported that Reorganization did not meet in January.

### **Routine Revision Committee**

Chairperson, Ms. Prescott reported that Routine Revision did not meet in January 2004, but is scheduled to meet February 24, 2004.

## **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

### **Item 1357: Sprint LD Membership Application**

Ms. Dell solicited a motion to approve the Consent Calendar. Mr. Brown motioned to accept and approve Item 1357. Ms. Prouty seconded the motion, which upon voting passed unanimously.

## **DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

### **Item 1350: 2004 Pole Prices– Authorized Costs**

Mr. Rabe opened the discussion by distributing copies of the NCJPA Pole Price Matrix (see attached). Ms. Corella distributed the SCJPC Pole Price Matrix (see attached). Mr. Rabe opened dialogue with item 1 on the NCJPA matrix. He stated

that the pole price utilized by the north is based on the pole which is predominately used in joint pole ownership replacements (Class 3, 45' to 50'). Item 3-Transport and Handling is also based on average hours to load and transport pole to the job site. Mr. Solorzano requested a copy of the original NCJPA worksheet, which served as a template for the current draft distributed by Mr. Rabe. Mr. Rabe responded that he would provide the members with the original copy.

Next, Mr. Rabe discussed the SCJPC item 4 – Pre-Planning and engineering, which is item 8 on the NCJPA matrix. Mr. Rabe stated that both parties incur this cost when setting a pole, because joint owners must plan and engineer their part in setting or replacing a pole. Ms. Dell stated that it appears to her, that what Mr. Rabe is saying is that since both parties incur this cost, that perhaps it is a wash and should not be included in the elements. He responded that there is no way to control the time and costs incurred in planning and engineering, and this should be a negotiated/agreed upon cost. Mr. Solorzano questioned if Mr. Rabe's basis of discussion was on setting new poles, or pole replacements. Mr. Rabe responded that there is a significant difference in the two, and that the NCJPA concentrated on pole replacements. Mr. Rabe stated that SBC is expensing approximately 15 to 25 million dollars a year on an average for pole replacements, which caught the attention of upper management. Mr. Solorzano inquired if upper management was aware that there exist today different programs than existed earlier. Mr. Rabe responded that they are aware of this, as well as the increase in quantity. He further stated that there is no problem with quantity, but the issue is the increased costs of pole replacements. Ms. Dell questioned the element of pre-planning and engineering, and the other member's position on this issue. In her opinion, it does not matter whether a member is the initiator or the receiver on the JPA; the individual planning is for each respective member's benefit. Therefore, Ms. Dell is questioning why the element is included in the pole pricing. Mr. Rabe responded that it was a compromise within the NCJPA. Mr. Allen stated that pre-planning entails the initial field meet, interaction with the other joint members, and the processing time. This is not the project time. Ms. Dell agreed with Mr. Allen, but responded that the other joint members are also expensing the time. Therefore, in her opinion, these costs cancel out. Mr. Solorzano responded that this might be volume driven. Some members may be replacing thousands of poles annually, where other members are placing a significant smaller amount. Ms. Dell responded that in her opinion, volume is not a factor in this situation. Mr. Rabe spoke of the costs incurred when maintaining poles in inventory, and that these costs should be considered. Mr. Solorzano stressed the issue of maintaining and procuring inventory for those primary pole-setting organizations to support pole replacements. In this case volume is an issue. Mr. Rabe further stated that the primary concern with the NCJPA is what is fair and equitable in regards to pole costs. Mr. Solorzano stated that the discussion should identify what elements and materials are mutually beneficial to all members.

Mr. Rabe stated that PG&E attempt to reduce carrying charges by maintaining a smaller pole inventory. They do so by maintaining a finite number of poles smaller than their annual pole sets. PG&E sets an average of 19,000 to 21,000 replacement poles a year.

Mr. Rabe then discussed designing the construction on poles, and the fact that SBC has no control over the overhead design by power utilities, therefore, SBC should not be held accountable for extra costs. Mr. Schmaderer stated that it appears the Mr. Rabe is under the impression that overhead design is the only

obstruction in replacing poles. He further stated that 75% of poles are on property lines, and there are buildings and trees that obstruct as well. Therefore, whoever sets the pole must overcome other obstacles as well besides overhead design in order to set the pole in the ground. Furthermore, according to Mr. Schmaderder configuration is not the only problem in setting poles. Mr. Rabe agreed, however, in his opinion pole costs should be based on an average pole set situation, not best or worst case scenario. Mr. Schmaderder noted that SBC could set a 45' pole for approximately \$1,600.00, a number lower than the City of Pasadena, and questioned Mr. Rabe as to why he is not setting the pole, and Pasadena would gladly share in the lower cost of setting a pole. Mr. Solorzano added that if SBC set a pole and the submitted cost (not actual cost) to SBC is \$1,600.00, using the weighted average method, SBC would be made whole should they be the pole setting entity. He further stated that in the past, the members briefly discussed the issue of each individual member applying their individual pole cost (resulting in 28 pole prices). Like Mr. Schmaderder, Mr. Solorzano would support sharing in the lower cost of setting a pole, if SBC would agree to participate in a pole replacement program. Mr. Rabe would support this idea, however, prior to SBC initiating a pole replacement program there are many issues to be addressed, such as a joint contracting effort to accommodate everyone, in order to achieve that high quality, low cost work. He further stated that SBC would support that idea, but issues would have to be addressed, and agreements would have to be reached.

Mr. Rabe stated that SBC would like to share the NCJPA and the SCJPC method of arriving at pole costs. Mr. Solorzano questioned if the NCJPA would utilize the weighted average method. Mr. Rabe responded that the members agreed to use the weighted average method.

Mr. Solorzano reiterated that the impact of pole costs is upon the primary pole setters, such as SCE, and volume is a factor in this situation. Ms. Dell questioned Mr. Solorzano if he had worked the dollars to compare what the other joint owners pay when SCE sets a pole. Mr. Solorzano responded that based on SCE's submitted prices, the cost to SCE for a 45' pole is \$2,641.00 (\$58.68/foot), on a joint pole the sale of 2 feet would reimburse SCE \$997.00. The same situation on a three party pole the amount would be \$1,400.00. Based on this a joint member on a three party pole would pay \$700.00, which is substantially less than what it would cost them to set a pole. Mr. Solorzano is of the opinion that it would be cost effective to joint members to have SCE set the pole. Mr. Solorzano remarked that if other members set the poles, the cost to buy into a pole would be less to SCE than their current unit cost. Mr. Robinson stated that the problem with that situation is the compliance issue with the CPUC. The pole would be labeled "E" poles, and if any questions or issues arrive the CPUC would initially contact SCE. Mr. Solorzano stated that obviously, SBC would like to reduce the cost of placing poles within the state of California. To this, Mr. Solorzano questioned Mr. Rabe if in fact, SBC is seriously considering initiating a pole placement program, and has SBC considered the additional costs this sort of program would generate. Mr. Rabe responded that SBC has considered a program. Mr. Solorzano stated that SCE is considering replacing 35,000 pole a year, and questioned if SBC intends on handling a percentage of replacements. Mr. Rabe responded that if there is a collective agreement among the members, SBC would handle replacements. Mr. Solorzano then questioned Mr. Rabe if SBC has a documented proposal on pole replacement, and if so would like to review it. Mr. Rabe responded that at this point in time, SBC does not have a proposal because there are many issues that need addressing. Ms.

Dell questioned Mr. Solorzano if the costs he quoted are for all poles, or jointly owned poles only. Mr. Solorzano responded that it pertains to joint poles only.

Mr. Rabe stated that he would like the members of the SCJPC to consider the elements used in creating the pole price structure, and work toward an amicable agreement. Mr. Brown recommended scheduling a special Authorized Costs Committee meeting to further discuss this issue. It was agreed that the members would work with Mr. Rabe's schedule. Mr. Rabe would contact Ms. Prouty, Ms. Prouty would inform Ms. Corella, and then Ms. Corella would notify the members on the preferred date for Mr. Rabe.

**Item 1330: Revised 2002 Steel Prices– Authorized Costs**

It was agreed that this item is return to the Authorized Costs Committee for further discussion.

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1280: Authorized Signatures – RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1330: Revised 2002 Steel Prices- AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1332: DWP Multi Member Codes – OPERATING
- Item 1334: Visibility Strips - ROUTINE REVISION
- Item 1341: Storm Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1342: Tennis Shoes on Wires - ROUTINE REVISION
- Item 1343: Routine Revision – ROUTINE REVISION
- Item 1346: iPole Sharing with NCJPC - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1349: Review Initial Membership Fee - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1350: 2004 Pole Prices - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1351: 2004 Authorized Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1355: JPC Property Rights Protection - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1356: Review of By-Laws - RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1357: Sprint LD Membership Application - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1358: PG&E Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1359: City of Vernon Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1360: Crane Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1361: Removal of Ivy - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1362: City of Banning Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE

There was no discussion on unfinished business items. The above items remain open.

**Open Administrative Board Items**

Item 1339– *Environmental Issues*

This item remains open as an ongoing issue to ensure the Committee addresses any necessary environmental issues.

**New Business**

***Known Items:***

There were no known items to report.

***Unknown Items:***

Mr. Brown reported that on February 11<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 am, a car hit a joint pole located in Tustin. The pole was an Edison based pole, and Verizon Wireless is a joint owner on the pole. This incident created an unbalanced load, and everything on the pole was down in the intersection. Mr. Brown stated that the pole had 6 conductors of 12 KV, SCE communication, ICG fiber, and 2 ATC fiber lines. Mr. Brown remarked that in his career, he has never witnessed such a scene. He further stated that Verizon Wireless was not aware of the situation until noon that day. Mr. Brown stated that he became aware of the problem when SCE cut ATC wires to get them out of harms way. Mr. Brown stated that the wires are like transmission lines to ATC in that it carries live cellular traffic switch to switch. However, ATC designs in anticipation of some sort of interruption. Mr. Brown's concern is whether this is common practice for SCE when dealing with joint member facilities in this type of situation to cut lines without notifying joint members. Mr. Solorzano responded that it is not, and that the common practice is for SCE to contact other members. Mr. Robinson stated that at times the city fire department will instruct SCE to cut the lines, or the fire department will cut the lines themselves. Mr. Brown stated that these down wires were not in the way, and could be moved out of the way, rather than being cut. Mr. Brown further stated that if ATC had been contacted, they would have moved the facilities. Mr. Schmadederder stated that in many similar instances, facilities are not marked, and it is difficult identifying who owns the facilities on the pole. Mr. Brown responded that ATC tagged all their wires, and in this case the wires were identifiable. Mr. Solorzano asked Mr. Brown to obtain the particulars, and Mr. Solorzano would research the situation.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Authorized Costs			To Be Announced
Routine Revision	02/24/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Administrative Board	03/17/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	03/17/04	Following	Administrative Board
ReOrganization	03/17/04	Following	Operating Committee

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Dell adjourned the meeting at 11:45 a.m., until March 17, 2004.

---

Ms. Kathleen Dell, President

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

Attachments

## NCJPA Pole Price Matrix

### Definitions of Matrix Cost Elements (Draft #3, 2/08/04)

1. **LENGTH** – The length and class of pole the pole price elements are utilized on. For the purposes of the NCJPA use, a Class #3 45' to 50' pole is used as the predominate jointly owned pole size/class used in a majority (estimated between 65% to 80%) of jointly owned pole placements or replacements.
2. **Total # of Joint Poles Set** – (No definition/determination made yet on the use of this price column element as of this document's draft date and is still open for NCJPA Price Committee discussion).
3. **Material Cost (F.O.B.) Pole (wood)** – The **AVERAGE** material expense (in US dollars including sales tax and transportation costs from supplier) of a pole delivered to the first destination point (usually a purchaser's construction yard). Average material costs are used to account for the purchase/delivery cost differences between NCJPA memberships and their respective use of volume purchase leverage.  
  
This material cost is for wood poles only. The costs of poles other than wood (i.e., fiberglass composite, steel and concrete) shared between NCJPA members shall be negotiated on a case by case basis.
4. **Transport and Handling** – The **AVERAGE** amount of time (in hours and/or quarter hour increments) it takes to load the pole onto a pole dolly and transport to the job site. The average amount of time can be multiplied by the average direct labor hour of the technician(s) loading and transporting the pole to arrive at the cost of pole loading and transportation and shown in US Dollars.
5. **Digging and Erecting** – The **AVERAGE** technician man hours of an average sized crew to dig the pole hole, erect the pole, plumb the pole, backfill and compaction tamp the pole in place. The average total man hours include set-up, take down of the work operation.
6. **Direct Labor (Loaded)** – The **AVERAGE** non-premium hourly rate of a field technician (shown in US dollars) that includes cost of medical benefits. The average non-premium hourly rate is average between the high and the low hourly rate of the labor classification (or title) directly involved in setting the pole.
7. **Equipment Costs** – The expense (shown in US dollars) of the equipment directly used in the placement or replacement of a jointly owned pole. The expenses should include fuel, oil and average maintenance costs. For the purposes of determining this expense a combination digger/derrick vehicle, aerial personnel lift and direct supervision pickup truck is used to determine this expense.
8. **Supply Expense** – The average expense for storing the pole prior to use (shown in US dollars), i.e., cost of storage (inventory expense). This is usually derived or calculated as a percentage of the material cost of the pole.
9. **Engineering and Planning** – The average expense (shown in US dollars) for site survey, pole loading calculation and JPA document preparation of a jointly owned pole. This is calculated by labor hours for engineering and planning for the defined work steps multiplied by the average labor hour of the labor class (or title) doing the engineering and planning work.
10. **General & Administration** – The average expense for additional labor (shown in US dollars) for direct clerical support, direct supervision of the field crew and indirect supervision of the crew placing the pole. This is usually derived or calculated as a percentage of Direct Labor Rate.
11. **Total** – The total cost (shown in US dollars) to place or replace a jointly owned pole. This is the sum of columns #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, and #10 of the Pole Price Matrix.

## SCJPC DEFINITIONS OF ELEMENTS

- 1) Length - Length of pole purchased.
- 2) Class - American Standards Association Classification of poles purchased.
- 3) Cost F.O.B. - The raw cost of the pole, including sales tax, to the purchaser's supply yard (first drop point) with no overheads or supply expense added
- 4) Pre-Planning and Engineering Fee/Hours – This fee/associated hour(s) is established to identify the analysis required to determine the scope of work to be performed in the field, prior to the actual planning and construction work order preparation to place or replace a pole. The cost should be based on the submitted loaded labor rate by each utility multiplied by the amount of hour(s) taken to perform this task on a per pole basis. 1 hour was established based on submitting utilities loaded labor rate.
- 5) Transporting and Handling - The average number of employee hours (rounded to one decimal place, i.e., nearest one tenth of an hour) related to loading and transporting a pole from the distribution point to the job site. (Reflects only employees directly related to the loading and transporting operation). Two (2) hours has been determined as an acceptable average for this activity, however variations are allowed when necessary.
- 6) Digging and Erecting - The average number of employee hours (rounded to one decimal place, i.e., nearest one tenth of an hour) associated with digging and erecting a pole. The hours designated for this activity should also include the set-up time to perform the job, the safety tailboard meeting, and the demobilization at the conclusion of the job.  
Note: Digging reflects an average of all soil conditions and setting locations (e.g. property line or curbside). Excluded are transportation and handling which was addressed under column 4.
- 7) Loaded Labor Dollars - **This column for Committee office use only.**
- 8) Supply Expense - Can be expressed as the job order pole cost minus the purchase price (cost F.O.B.), or as a percentage of the F.O.B. cost. This can include:
  - Inventory Expense;
  - Cost of Storage;
  - Insurance;
  - Labor associated with transporting the pole from the first drop off point to the distribution point, but does not include costs reported in column 4.
- 9) General and Administrative Expense - These include costs that are incurred by a Member to provide staff support and staff management functions (usually expressed as a percentage). This excludes all direct loadings associated with the Loaded Labor Rate.
- 10) Total - **This column for Committee office use only.**
- 11) Loaded Labor Rate - The published loaded labor rate used by the reporting Member for construction activities. This rate includes all administrative, clerical, and supervisory support up to and including the management levels that are involved in direct supervision of such activities. This excluded costs associated with general and administrative expenses accounted for separately.

## **Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3  
San Dimas, CA 91773  
Phone (909) 592-4001  
Fax (909) 592-4636

March 17, 2004

A regular meeting of the **Administrative Board** took place on the above date, at 9:00 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Doug Schmaderer	City of Pasadena
Mr. Randall Starkey	Adelphia Communications
Mr. Dan Lewis	Southern California Edison
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Don Beckermann	MCI Telecommunications
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS
Ms. Velma Prouty	SBC Pacific Bell
Mr. Larry Paschall	AT&T Local Services
Ms. Monica Marks	AT&T Local Services
Mr. Tibor Laky	Sprint L.P.
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Paula Haney	Verizon California
Ms. Kathleen Dell	AT&T Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

Guests:	Mr. Jorge Somoano	City of Vernon
	Mr. Ali Nour	City of Vernon

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Ms. Dell called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. She then allowed for introductions.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Ms. Dell asked the members to review the minutes of the February 18, 2004 Board meeting. After the members reviewed the minutes, Ms. Dell inquired if there were any corrections, additions or deletions to the minutes. There being no additions, corrections, or deletions, Ms. Dell asked for a motion of approval. Mr. Lewis motioned to approve the February 18, 2004 minutes as written. Ms. Haney seconded the motion, which upon voting, passed unanimously.

## **MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the gross operating expenses for February 2004 totaled \$82,647.54. This amount reflects the second contract installment payment of \$37,500.00 payable to Hyperlink. The members received a credit disbursed from the Sprint L.P. initial membership fee. Therefore, after deducting the proportioned credits from the February invoices, the members were assessed \$44,597.43 totally.

## **COMMUNICATIONS:**

Ms. Corella then reported on the current **iPole status**. She stated that at the previous Board meeting, she had distributed CD copies of iPole (pre-release version) to members. She inquired if any members had installed the software, and had any questions, or concerns. Ms. Prouty stated that her organization has tried the software, and has encountered a problem. However, she further stated that she has communicated this issue with Mr. Atalla, and that he is aware of it. Ms. Dell inquired into the issue that SBC encountered. Ms. Prouty responded that it is a security issue of the SCJPC database, and deals with firewalls and ports. Ms. Corella stated that Mr. Atalla would be reporting to the members later in the meeting on the issue of iPole and security.

Next, Ms. Corella reported on an email she received from Mr. Don Beckermann of **MCI Telecommunications**. In the message, it states that MCI Telecommunications no longer employs Mr. Lee Pemberton. She asked Mr. Beckermann to expand on the restructuring that MCI Telecommunications is experiencing. Mr. Beckermann reported that Mr. Alan Nagle, who served as the alternate for MCI Telecommunications, is no longer with MCI. He further stated that any issues that concern MCI Telecommunications, or MCI Metro, should be addressed to him. Ms. Dell requested that Mr. Beckermann send a correspondence, on MCI letterhead, stating the new representative and alternate for the Committee office files.

Ms. Corella reported on **Item 1358: PG&G Membership Reinstatement**. She reported that she has received a correspondence from Mr. Steve Grimes of PG&E. They are requesting an additional 90-day extension to the membership reinstatement invitation. This would extend the invitation to June 30, 2004. Ms. Corella reported that this item would be discussed further at the next Operating Committee meeting.

Lastly, Ms. Corella reported on **Item 1355: JPC Property Rights Protection**. Ms. Corella stated that she has received a copy of the evaluation of the JPC property rights protection from Mr. Tom Daly, the Committee property rights legal counsel. She further stated that she has emailed the members a copy of the 4-page evaluation for their review. She questioned if all the members have received their copies. She announced that the Operating Committee would be reviewing the submitted evaluation, and discussing how to move forward in regards to the copyrights protection, and dealing with Hyperlink.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

Ms. Corella announced that Mr. Ali Nour, and Mr. Jorge Somoano, from the **City of Vernon**, had attended the meeting as guests to address the issue of membership reinstatement. Mr. Somoano stated that he would like to bring this issue to the next city council meeting, but would like some questions answered. Mr. Nour stated that their attendance was to express their sincere interest in membership reinstatement. Mr. Somoano stated that the Agreement does not allude to membership reinstatement. He inquired if reinstatement would serve as though they had never left the Committee. Ms. Dell responded that they previously were limited members, however, there is no longer a two-tier membership, and that Vernon would now be, as all other members are, a regular member. Ms. Corella stated that they would be reinstated at their original membership date. Again, Mr. Somoano stated that the Agreement does not mention reinstatement, and he may have difficulty with the city council. Ms. Dell responded that rather than using the term reinstatement, that this should be viewed as an additional five-year extension to sign the 1998 Agreement. It was agreed that the City of Vernon would submit a letter requesting an additional 90-day extension. The Committee would respond, and attach a copy of the minutes approving membership reinstatement to former members in order for Mr. Somoano to present at the next City of Vernon council meeting. Mr. Nour stated that upon being accepted as members, could Vernon begin processing the work orders from the last five years. Ms. Dell responded that upon the receipt of the reinstatement fee, they could start processing JPAs. She further stated that, however, Vernon should bear in mind that the other members, if inundated with JPAs, could request additional time to respond. Mr. Nour agreed and stated it is understood. The Committee thanked Mr. Nour and Mr. Somoano for their attendance.

## **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

### **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements**

Chair, Ms. Goetz reported that Authorized Costs did not meet in February.

### **Operating Committee**

Chairperson, Ms. Prescott reported that Operating Committee did meet in February, and to please refer to the minutes of that meeting for details. She further stated that Mr. Brown sent his apologies for not attending, however, he had some other business to attend to.

### **ad hoc Committee on Reorganization**

Chairperson, Ms. Prouty reported that Reorganization did not meet in February.

## **Routine Revision Committee**

Chairperson, Ms. Prescott reported that Routine Revision did meet in February 2004, and the focus of that meeting was the review of the Routine Handbook. She stated that this item would be ongoing for the next several months.

### **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

There were no items for consent.

### **DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

There were no items for discussion.

### **OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

Item 1280: Authorized Signatures – RE-ORGANIZATION  
Item 1330: Revised 2002 Steel Prices- AUTHORIZED COSTS  
Item 1332: DWP Multi Member Codes – OPERATING  
Item 1334: Visibility Strips - ROUTINE REVISION  
Item 1341: Storm Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS  
Item 1342: Tennis Shoes on Wires - ROUTINE REVISION  
Item 1343: Routine Revision – ROUTINE REVISION  
Item 1346: iPole Sharing with NCJPC - OPERATING COMMITTEE  
Item 1349: Review Initial Membership Fee - OPERATING COMMITTEE  
Item 1350: 2004 Pole Prices - AUTHORIZED COSTS  
Item 1351: 2004 Authorized Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS  
Item 1355: JPC Property Rights Protection - OPERATING COMMITTEE  
Item 1356: Review of By-Laws - RE-ORGANIZATION  
Item 1358: PG&E Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE  
Item 1359: City of Vernon Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE  
Item 1360: Crane Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS  
Item 1361: Removal of Ivy - AUTHORIZED COSTS  
Item 1362: City of Banning Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE

Ms. Dell gave a brief summary of the items on unfinished business. All items will remain open at this time.

### **Open Administrative Board Items**

Item 1339– *Environmental Issues*

This item remains open as an ongoing issue to ensure the Committee addresses any necessary environmental issues.

## **New Business**

### ***Known Items:***

Ms. Walls raised the issue of pole inspection JPAs. He stated that DWP would like to adopt the method SCE is utilizing when submitting this type of JPA. This entails submitting a report summary of poles that were inspected, rather than creating JPAs with the poles individually typed on the JPA. Mr. Walls stated that this would eliminate labor hours on behalf of his clerical staff. He further inquired if the members would have any objection, if DWP followed the SCE format in submitting pole inspection JPAs. Ms. Dell responded that prior to moving forward on this, she would like further discussion on this issue. The method SCE is utilizing is submitting a summary of poles inspected; the JPC staff researches the poles, and makes any corrections required, then returns the JPAs to SCE for final billing. Ms. Dell is of the opinion that, SCE is utilizing the JPC staff to handle SCE tasks. Ms. Dell further remarked that SCE is using the JPC staff to verify the poles, and this should be an SCE task, therefore, if SCE is utilizing the JPC staff for their tasks, they should be assessed separately. She further added that she should not receive a JPA that has been finalized, without reviewing the preliminary. Ms. Dell is fine with the SCE method: however, members need the opportunity to review the preliminaries for verification. It was agreed to discuss this issue further at the following Operating Committee meeting.

Ms. Goetz announced that Authorized Costs would meet on March 24<sup>th</sup>. She requested that SBC present their proposal for a pole replacement program at that meeting. Ms. Prouty responded that she would have the proposal ready as well as the SBC agenda.

### ***Unknown Items:***

Mr. Paschall reported that City of Los Angeles personnel (not DWP) have been contacting him constantly to remove their facilities from poles. He further stated that he has not received a JPA, nor does AT&T have available funding at this time for such a project. Mr. Walls responded that the personnel contacting him is from the Public Works Department. He further stated that when contacted by Public works, DWP must remove and relocate poles and/or facilities. Mr. Walls requested the pole number/numbers in question, and he would research the issue and contact Mr. Paschall with the results.

## **SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows: To Be Announced

Authorized Costs	03/24/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Routine Revision	04/06/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Administrative Board	04/21/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	04/21/04	Following	Administrative Board
ReOrganization	04/21/04	Following	Operating Committee

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Dell adjourned the meeting at 10:05 a.m., until April 21, 2004.

---

Ms. Kathleen Dell, President

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

**Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3  
San Dimas, CA 91773  
Phone (909) 592-4001  
Fax (909) 592-4636

April 21, 2004

A regular meeting of the **Administrative Board** took place on the above date, at 9:00 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Doug Schmaderer	City of Pasadena
Mr. Randall Starkey	Adelphia Communications
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Robert Allen	City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS
Ms. Velma Prouty	SBC Pacific Bell
Mr. Charles Vranek	Cingular Wireless
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Paula Haney	Verizon California
Ms. Kathleen Dell	AT&T Wireless
Mr. Dave Barrett	AT&T Local Services
Mr. Mahendra Garg	City of Anaheim
Ms. Norine Luker	NetG Networks
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

Guests: Mr. Steve Grimes Pacific Gas & Electric

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Ms. Dell called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. She then allowed for introductions.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Ms. Dell asked the members to review the minutes of the March 17, 2004 Board meeting. After the members reviewed the minutes, Ms. Dell inquired if there were any corrections, additions or deletions to the minutes. There being no additions, corrections, or deletions, Ms. Dell asked for a motion of approval. Mr. Brown motioned to approve the March 17, 2004 minutes as written. Ms. Haney seconded the motion, which upon voting, passed unanimously.

## MANAGER'S REPORT

Ms. Corella reported that the gross operating expenses for March 2004 totaled \$45,020.40. This amount reflects an average monthly assessment.

## COMMUNICATIONS:

Ms. Corella then reported on the current **iPole status**. Ms. Corella reported that Mr. Atalla, and the members, are experiencing security issues. Some of the members respective IT departments have a concern with the issue of security, and opening a port to allow access to the iPole database. Therefore, Mr. Atalla initially proposed the members acquire VPN, which is a direct connection between the iPole database, and the member utility server. Therefore, this would keep all other traffic out, but that which pertains to iPole. However, Mr. Atalla is of the opinion that this solution to the security issue is not the only option. He is proposing developing iPole and making it web based, using the SCJPC website for handling iPole transactions. She further reported that DWP has installed the iPole CD distributed by Mr. Atalla and is attempting to use the software. Mr. Atalla has stated that this new version of iPole should take approximately six months. He further has informed the membership, that this additional project is at no cost to the Committee. Some members reported that they could not access the iPole database, because of the security issue. Ms. Prouty reported that she has emailed Mr. Atalla with SBC security issues, however, she has not received a response to date. When her organization receives the answers from Mr. Atalla, than her organization may move forward with iPole. Mr. Walls reported that in his opinion the creating of a JPA with a new pole record is slow and cumbersome. The members discussed the issue of entering new poles into the iPole database. Ms. Dell has a concern with the ability of anyone entering pole information into the database without some form of control, and another concern of Ms. Dell is the high probability of error. Mr. Walls responded that members staff needs the ability to enter poles into the database, because, the pole must have a record in order to get it on a preliminary JPA. Ms. Corella stated that today, the members create a preliminary JPA manually. The current pole database is maintained by the JPC office, however, when iPole is implemented the members would create the preliminary using the iPole software, to allow for the electronic mailing of JPAs. Ms. Corella further stated that the current task of entering new poles into the database would be done by the members, and not by the JPC office as is maintained today. Ms. Prouty stated that she does not remember having the members enter new poles. Ms. Corella responded that this was created in OpCats, and Mr. Atalla discovered this when researching OpCats. Ms. Corella reported that the new pole record would not become a permanent record until the JPC office updates it. The method in which Mr. Atalla addressed this issue is by programming iPole, so that the new poles would remain in pending status until the JPC office approves the JPA. Ms. Dell reiterated her concern with the widespread access to the database by so many, and again the probability of error. Ms. Corella responded that transposition errors could occur even today, with the manual method. The JPC staff would enter the new pole number as it was typed on the finalized JPA, and if it is incorrectly typed by a members staff, the JPC office has no way of verifying the number. Ms. Thomas stated that with iPole, you are unable

to change an existing pole, so in her opinion the controls are set in place. The consensus is that the members have no problem with the allowing of members and their staffs access to enter new poles into the iPole database, but are not allowed to make any changes, which still remains in the control of the JPC office. Mr. Walls inquired as to what the next step with iPole. The members agreed to discuss iPole further at the following Operating meeting.

Next, Ms. Corella reported on **Item 1359: City of Vernon Reinstatement**. She reported that the Committee office has received the City of Vernon signed Resolution. They are anxious to become active Committee members; therefore, they would like to pay their reinstatement fee as soon as possible. Ms. Corella further stated that the issue that requires discussion, is how to arrive at the method of calculating the reinstatement fee. The Operating Committee met on April 14<sup>th</sup> to discuss this issue, and it is on the Discussion Calendar of the current meeting to be agreed upon by the Board.

Ms. Corella reported on a correspondence she received from T-Mobile displaying an interest in Committee membership (see attachment). Ms Corella read the correspondence to the members. She further reported that she would begin the application process immediately.

### **SPECIAL REPORTS**

There were no special reports.

### **SPECIAL GUESTS**

Ms. Dell inquired if there were any questions Mr. Grimes would like addressed at this time. Mr. Grimes responded that he was in attendance as an observer, and that PG&E is interested in reinstatement. The NCJPA also has an interest in iPole, and mechanizing the JPA process. Mr. Solorzano questioned, if and when, the NCJPA planned on approving reinstatement. Mr. Grimes responded that he would be meeting with PG&E to discuss ownership versus leasing pole space.

### **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

#### **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements**

Chairman, Mr. Solorzano reported that Authorized Costs met in March, and the ad hoc Committee was successful in approving several items for the current Discussion Calendar (please refer to the minutes for further details).

#### **Operating Committee**

Chairman, Mr. Brown reported that Operating Committee did meet in March (please refer to the minutes for further details). Mr. Brown further reported that the Operating Committee had an impromptu meeting to discuss the reinstatement fee.

The City of Vernon, which is anxious to start the process of JPAs, prompted this issue. The issue of reinstatement is on the current Discussion Calendar with the suggested proposal for how reinstatement fees should be calculated.

### **ad hoc Committee on Reorganization**

Chairperson, Ms. Prouty reported that Reorganization did not meet in March.

### **Routine Revision Committee**

Chairperson, Ms. Prescott reported that Routine Revision did meet on April 6, 2004, and the focus of that meeting continues to be the review of the Routine Handbook. She stated that the ad hoc Committee reviewed Sections 1 through 12, and these Sections would be on the Consent Calendar of the next Board Meeting Agenda.

### **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

There were no items for consent.

### **DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

The first issue on Discussion was **Item 1330: Revised 2002 Steel Pole Prices**. Mr. Solorzano stated that the discussion would be on adopting the proposed steel pole prices. The original concern was the crane costs. Initially, SBC had a concern with embedding the crane cost into the total cost of steel poles. However, it has been clarified that 40 foot poles, and greater, are manufactured in two parts, therefore, requiring the assistance of a crane when setting this type pole. The earlier proposed pole sheet reflected crane costs on 35-foot poles, and cranes are not required. However, the crane costs have been removed from this size pole. The members briefly discussed this issue, and agreed that the costs were reasonable. Mr. Brown motioned to accept, and approve the revised 2002-2003 revised steel pole prices as proposed. Mr. Solorzano seconded the motion, which upon voting, was approved unanimously.

The next issue for discussion was **Item 1334: Visibility Strips**. The Authorized Costs Committee is proposing a cost for viz strips. The proposed item number would be 15.b, with a cost of \$10.00. Ms. Dell inquired if any members had a concern with this proposal. Ms. Haney stated that Verizon has a concern with this proposal, because, viz strips had been an authorized cost prior, and has since been removed. Therefore, in her opinion, she sees no need for reinstating this cost. Ms. Dell stated that she agreed with Ms. Haney. She further stated that historically, some Authorized Costs were removed, and it appears that there are proposals to reinstate these costs. Mr. Schraderer stated that since the implementation of General Order, there is today, the need to reinstate some of these previously removed costs, such as viz strips. He further stated that this cost, as well as pole tagging costs, does not deal with new pole sets, but with pole inspections. Mr.

Solorzano motioned to move this item to the Consent Calendar for Board approval. Mr. Schraderer seconded the motion to move this item to Consent. Ms. Haney, and Ms. Dell opposed the motion. Ms. Luker abstained. The remaining members approved. The motion carried. Once this item was on the Consent Calendar, Mr. Solorzano motioned to accept **Item 1334**, as written, with the costs to be added to the Routine Handbook, Authorized Costs. Mr. Schmaderer seconded the motion. Ms. Haney, and Ms. Dell opposed the motion. Ms. Luker abstained. The remaining members approved, and the motion carried.

**Item 1351: 2004 Authorized Costs** was discussed next. Mr. Solorzano stated that what the Authorized Costs Committee is proposing is a 2.5% increase for 2004. Also being proposed for 2005 is an additional 2.5% increase, with the caveat that the ad hoc Committee reviews those commonly used Authorized Costs to ensure the costs are in line with today's market. If it is determined that a greater increase than 2.5% is required, the ad hoc Committee will determine a reasonable cost. Mr. Allen motioned to accept Item 1351 as proposed. Mr. Schmaderer seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

Next discussion was on **Item 1361: Removal of Ivy**. The ad hoc Committee is proposing an Authorized Cost of \$200.00 for ivy removal. Ms. Prouty stated that she would like a photo of the pole with the ivy obstruction up to the power space, attached to the JPA, if this cost were adopted. Ms. Dell agreed with Ms. Prouty, in that this would be her concern as well. Ms. Haney is of the opinion that, if this is to address approximately 200 situations per year, than this issue could continue to be handled via Section 1.2, Special Agreement. Ms. Dell recommended a section be dedicated in the Routine Handbook to address, define, and clarify this cost. It was agreed to add this item to the Routine Revision agenda.

**Item 1363: Pole Price Matrix** was next on the Discussion Calendar. Authorized Costs is proposing adopting the NCJPA pole price matrix to determine pole costs. Ms. Prouty motioned to accept Item 1363 as proposed. Ms. Haney seconded the motion, which upon voting passed.

**Item 1364: Reinstatement Fee** was next for discussion. The Operating Committee is proposing to calculate the actual monthly assessments for the sixty plus months, that the former members were not actively participating in supporting the JPC office expenses. Mr. Brown stated that Operating would like to open this proposal for discussion. The members agreed that this would be the only time former members would be offered an invitation to rejoin the Committee. Any former members wishing to join the Committee, and did not avail themselves of this offer, would need to take the new member application route. Mr. Solorzano motioned to accept the proposal for Item 1364. Mr. Prouty seconded the motion, which upon voting passed unanimously.

The final item on the Discussion Calendar was **Item 1365: Concrete/Asphalt Break**. Mr. Walls brought this issue to Authorized Costs. The item description was corrected to read: **Concrete/Asphalt Break Temporary Asphalt Patch**. The ad hoc Committee is proposing an \$88.00 cost for this work. After discussion and review, the consensus is to return this item to the ad hoc Committee for further discussion.

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1280: Authorized Signatures – RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1330: Revised 2002 Steel Prices- AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1334: Visibility Strips - ROUTINE REVISION
- Item 1341: Storm Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1343: Routine Revision – ROUTINE REVISION
- Item 1346: iPole Sharing with NCJPC - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1349: Review Initial Membership Fee - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1350: 2004 Pole Prices - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1351: 2004 Authorized Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1355: JPC Property Rights Protection - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1356: Review of By-Laws - RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1358: PG&E Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1359: City of Vernon Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1360: Crane Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1361: Removal of Ivy - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1362: City of Banning Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1363: Pole Price Matrix - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1364: Reinstatement Fee - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1365: Concrete/Asphalt Break - AUTHORIZED COSTS

**Open Administrative Board Items**

Item 1339– *Environmental Issues*

This item remains open as an ongoing issue to ensure the Committee addresses any necessary environmental issues.

**New Business**

***Known Items:***

Ms. Prescott reported that at the prior Routine Revision meeting, there was discussion revolved around anchor and overhead and down guys. They agreed that the costs associated with anchors and guys should be reviewed. Therefore, it was agreed to open an item number, and assign it to the ad hoc Authorized Costs Committee for review. **Item 1366: Review of Anchors, Overhead Guys, and down Guys**, has been assigned to the Authorized Costs Committee.

Ms. Corella stated that the City of Banning, who is reviewing membership reinstatement, has requested a copy of the Routine Handbook. Ms. Corella stated that she is aware, that only current members are privy to the Handbook, therefore,

on behalf of the City of Banning, she is requesting the authority to send a copy of the Handbook to the City of Banning. The members approved Ms. Corella mail a copy of the Routine Handbook to Banning.

Ms. Dell raised the issue of **pole loading**. Ms. Dell stated that in the last three to four years, the members have discussed pole/wind-loading issues on several occasions. Therefore, she stated that it is her understanding that, if a pole is discovered by a member to be overloaded prior to attaching to the pole, that this should be handled using Section 7.11. The attending members stated they understood, and agreed with Ms. Dell. Also, Ms. Dell further stated that it is her understanding, that it is not the responsibility of the members to police, and attempt to investigate which member created a pole loading violation. However, she further stated, if a pole becomes overloaded after attaching her equipment onto the pole, then, she uses Section 7.3.

Ms. Dell opened further discussion on policing of poles. She stated that it has been agreed among the members, that they would not police one another on GO 95 violations. She stressed that the JPA is not the conduit to identify GO 95 violations. She stated that if a member discovers a violation that could put personnel in danger, this requires an immediate communication to that member in violation of GO 95 for the safety of all involved. Ms. Dell reiterated that GO 95 is not part of the Routine Handbook, or the SCJPC. Ms. Thomas reported a situation of reviewing a JPA, and noting a GO 95 infraction, how does one member notify the initiating member that they cannot build until the infraction is corrected. Ms. Dell responded that it is not the responsibility of the reviewing member to stop the initiating member from building. Ms. Thomas responded that, according to Ms. Dell, members could build into an existing GO 95 infraction, compounding the situation. The members disagreed, and stated that you cannot compound the situation by building when there is a GO 95 infraction. The violating member must be notified to correct the infraction, prior to build. Ms. Dell responded that what she is speaking of is, if she has the ability to build without creating an infraction, she will move forward with her build. Ms. Dell stressed that one cannot wait for the infraction to be corrected before building, because the time frame could be years before the violating member corrects the infraction. She further stated that one could not stop working in the field because of the infractions. Ms. Prouty stated that if the infraction restricted climbing a pole, how would a member build. Ms. Dell reiterated that the point she is attempting to communicate to the members is that the JPA, or Routine Handbook, is not the conduit for transferring this type (GO 95 infractions) of information. However, she does agree with the other members, that the violating member must be contacted to correct the infraction. As everyone agrees, she too does not want her personnel in eminent danger or harm. However, if there is no eminent danger, crews are not going to stop construction due to a GO 95 infraction.

Mr. Grimes reported that from his experience in the North, to stop construction could create a logistics nightmare. If you literally stopped construction with the volume of members on a pole and declined intent due to one member in violation of GO 95, this could create greater problems. However, a safety issue must be addressed. Mr. Schraderer stated that a violation should be identified during the make ready. Ms. Dell responded that this is when violations are identified, and handled appropriately. Mr. Prescott inquired as to how is the notification handled. Ms. Dell responded that she is aware that DWP uses a form

for notification, and that organization uses email, US mail or a phone call. Ms. Prescott stated that how can a member approve a JPA, when they are aware of the infraction, therefore, the only option a reviewing member has is to reject the JPA. Ms. Dell reiterated that members could not police one another in regards to GO 95. ***Ms. Haney stated that all the members are in agreement that the JPA is not the conduit for noting violations.*** Therefore, she suggested that after the discovering member has notified the violating member of the infraction, that a copy of the communication is attached to the JPA. This method would stop any notation of violations on the JPA, and would communicate to the other members on the JPA, that the violating member has been notified. Mr. Starkey reiterated that any violations that are hazardous should be handled via a phone call, or other form of communication to the violating member. Ms. Dell confirmed. Ms. Prescott then proposed the following situation: no longer are GO 95 violations allowed on JPA, her organization has received a JPA that is compounding a GO 95 violation, there is no notation of phone call or any form of communication to the violating member, how should this be handled. Mr. Solorzano responded to Ms. Prescott to deny the JPA. Ms. Dell responded that a JPA couldn't be denied because a joint member has a GO 95 infraction, and if the JPA is denied, it will be protested. Mr. Solorzano responded that a member could not build, and compound the problem. Ms. Dell stated that if a statement is made that a JPA could be rejected, due to a GO 95 violation, that her organization would reject 90% of all incoming JPAs. Ms. Haney clarified that Mr. Solorzano's intention is to reject the JPA, until the infraction is corrected. Ms. Dell responded that which member would determine the infraction as major or minor. Ms. Haney stated that the discussion is now leaning toward GO 95, and this should not be within the SCJPC area. **The final consensus among the attending members is that the JPA is not the conduit to note GO 95 violations.** This should be handled between joint members via some form of communication like email, US mail, or a phone call.

#### ***Unknown Items:***

Mr. Allen reported that he would like to review the minutes that address the issue of pole loading, and Section 7.11. In the last three years, the Committee has agreed that if a pole is discovered to be overloaded, the pole is replaced using Section 7.11, therefore, all joint members share in the cost of the replacement. Therefore, avoiding the exercise of attempting to discover which member created the violation.

Mr. Garg raised the issue of SBC does not transfer its facilities to the new pole in a timely manner, and leaves the old poles in the field for a long period. He stated that Anaheim City Council and utilities senior management were concerned since the Orange County news paper, the Register, published a complaint lodged by a resident on this issue. The City of Anaheim would like a contact at SBC. Ms. Prouty responded that she has given Mr. Garg a contact list. Mr. Garg responded that he has contacted some numbers on the list, and their response is that SBC does not have the staff to handle the situation. Mr. Garg handed Ms. Prouty a list with the locations of poles. Ms. Prouty responded that she would handle the situation by contacting the next level of managers to expedite correction of the problem. Mr. Solorzano remarked that if SBC is claiming that they do not have the staff available to pull the poles in the field; how are they going to launch a pole

inspection/replacement program, as claimed by Mr. Rabe. Ms. Prouty assured Mr. Garg that she would work with him diligently, until the situation is remedied.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows: To Be Announced

Authorized Costs	05/04/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Routine Revision	05/04/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Administrative Board	05/19/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	05/19/04	Following	Administrative Board
ReOrganization	05/19/04	Following	Operating Committee

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Dell adjourned the meeting at 11:25 a.m., until May 19, 2004.

---

Ms. Kathleen Dell, President

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

# T-Mobile

12920 SE 38th Street, Bellevue, WA 98006

April 13, 2004

Ms. Kathleen Dell  
President  
Southern California Joint Pole Committee  
437 S. Cataract Ave. Unit 3  
San Dimas, CA 91773

Dear Ms. Kathleen Dell

T-Mobile USA Inc. (T-Mobile), which is headquartered in Bellevue, WA, is a member of the T-Mobile International group, the mobile telecommunications subsidiary of Deutsche Telekom AG. T-Mobile operates the largest GSM/GPRS 1900 voice and data network in the country, reaching over 251 million people including roaming and other agreements.

In an effort to improve and expand our coverage, T-Mobile wishes to join the Southern California Joint Pole Committee. Membership on the committee will assist T-Mobile in reaching its goal of providing superior coverage while utilizing the existing vertical real estate managed by the joint pole committee. Common use of these existing structures is a benefit to both the co-owners and the community with whom we are working to provide service.

Please accept this letter as our formal request to join the committee

Sincerely,



Allan Tantillo

## Southern California Joint Pole Committee

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3  
San Dimas, CA 91773  
Phone (909) 592-4001  
Fax (909) 592-4636

May 19, 2004

\*\*Revised\*\*

A regular meeting of the **Administrative Board** took place on the above date, at 9:00 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Ernie Solorzano	Southern California Edison
Mr. Dan Lewis	Southern California Edison
Mr. Randy Kiljone	AT&T Wireless
Mr. Doug Schmaderer	City of Pasadena
Mr. Randall Starkey	Adelphia Communications
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Robert Allen	City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS
Ms. Velma Prouty	SBC Pacific Bell
Mr. Charles Vranek	Cingular Wireless
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Paula Haney	Verizon California
Mr. Don Beckerman	MCI Telecommunications
Mr. Mike Bogner	Sprint L.P.
Mr. Mahendra Garg	City of Anaheim
Ms. Norine Luker	NetG Networks
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Ms. Dell called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. She then allowed for introductions.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Ms. Dell asked the members to review the minutes of the April 21, 2004 Board meeting. After the members reviewed the minutes, Ms. Dell inquired if there were any corrections, additions or deletions to the minutes. There being no additions, corrections, or deletions, Ms. Dell asked for a motion of approval. Mr. Solorzano motioned to approve the April 21, 2004 minutes as written. Mr. Garg seconded the motion, which upon voting, passed unanimously.

## **MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the gross operating expenses for April 2004 totaled \$53,093.48. This amount reflects an above-average monthly assessment, due to an additional payroll period.

## **COMMUNICATIONS:**

Ms. Corella then reported on the current **iPole status**. Ms. Corella reported that the Operating Committee met and agreed that the iPole program required an ad hoc committee. Ms. Norine Luker, of NextG Networks volunteered to serve as Chairperson. The iPole ad hoc Committee met for the first time on May 18, 2004. Mr. Atalla attended the meeting to address the issue of security. Mr. Atalla encountered an obstacle in regards to security with some of the members IT departments. In order for the front line users to connect to the iPole database, ports 1433, 1434 must be open to traffic. Mr. Atalla stated that there are three options in regards to security and accessibility to the iPole database. Option 1) open the aforementioned ports, 2) install VPN between the members IT department, and the iPole server, and 3) rewrite the iPole software using the Microsoft.Net technology. Mr. Atalla highly recommends option three, and stated that his organization would rewrite the software at no additional cost to the Committee. Mr. Atalla has created a test application to be sent to the members to download, and test the ability to connect to the iPole database. Ms. Corella further reported that she would be forwarding the email she received from Mr. Atalla, as soon as possible, with the directions for testing. Mr. Dell stated that originally she had inquired if iPole would be web based, and was informed that it would not be. However, now it appears that the software would be rewritten as web based. Ms. Corella responded that she is not certain whether this is web based, or how this new technology operates. However, she further stated that it was not available when Mr. Atalla started creating the software. Ms. Corella reported that Mr. Atalla stated that he would have the iPole software Microsoft.Net version completed, and ready for testing by the Committee within four to five months. The next iPole ad hoc Committee would meet on June 16, 2004.

Next, Ms. Corella reported on **Item 1359: City of Vernon Reinstatement**, and their status. She has received their signed corporate resolution. Ms. Corella has mailed the reinstatement invoice to Vernon, and is waiting for payment. She further stated that in body of the invoice she informed them that they could not process JPAs until payment is received. Until that time they are not officially reinstated. The members agreed that all JPAs processed would be handled as though they have been members within the last five years, since their membership is bridged.

Lastly, Ms. Corella reported on Mr. Sheldon Cox of the City of Pasadena. He is currently out on disability. Ms. Corella had a plant sent to his home, on behalf of the Committee. She read a thank you card, from Mr. Cox received at the office.

**SPECIAL REPORTS**

There were no special reports.

**SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

**ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements**

Chairman, Mr. Solorzano reported that Authorized Costs met in April, (please refer to the minutes for further details)

**Operating Committee**

Chairman, Mr. Brown reported that Operating Committee did meet in April (please refer to the minutes for further details).

**ad hoc Committee on Reorganization**

Chairperson, Ms. Prouty reported that Reorganization did meet in April (please refer to the minutes for further details).

**Routine Revision Committee**

Chairperson, Ms. Prescott reported that Routine Revision did meet in April (Please refer to the minutes for further details).

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

There were no items for consent.

**DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

**Item 1350: 2004 Poles Prices** was the only issue on this calendar. Mr. Solorzano proposed a motion to accept allowing member utilities to opt to use individual prices for 2004, however to maintain continuity. Mr. Allen seconded the motion. Ms. Prouty, Ms. Haney, and Ms. Dell opposed, Mr. Starkey abstained, the remaining members approved. The motion carried with 58.13% voting shares approval, and 41.91% opposed. Mr. Solorzano than inquired if any other members were opting to have separate individual prices. Those members responding were the City of Anaheim, Verizon California, City of Pasadena, City of

Los Angeles, and SCE. Mr. Solorzano then motioned a proposal as follows: based on the previous motion, I motion that SCE, City of Los Angeles, City of Pasadena, City of Anaheim, and Verizon California opt to have their individual pole prices, while all other submitted prices will be used in the current weighted average methodology to be used in cross sharing with those utilities who have not submitted their pole prices. Mr. Garg seconded the motion. Ms. Prouty, and Ms. Dell opposed, Mr. Starkey abstained, the remaining members approved, therefore, the motion passed. Mr. Solorzano motioned to accept the 2004 weighted average pole prices, and the individual member pole prices. Mr. Schmaderer seconded the motion. Ms. Prouty, and Ms. Dell opposed, Mr. Starkey abstained, the remaining members approved. Ms. Dell announced that the pole prices for 2004 were officially approved.

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1280: Authorized Signatures – RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1341: Storm Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1343: Routine Revision – ROUTINE REVISION
- Item 1346: iPole Sharing with NCJPC - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1349: Review Initial Membership Fee - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1350: 2004 Pole Prices - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1356: Review of By-Laws - RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1358: PG&E Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1359: City of Vernon Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1360: Crane Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1361: Removal of Ivy - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1362: City of Banning Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1365: Concrete/Asphalt Break - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1366: Review Anchor, Overhead and Down Guys - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1367: T-Mobile Membership Application- OPERATING COMMITTEE

**Open Administrative Board Items**

Item 1339– *Environmental Issues*

This item remains open as an ongoing issue to ensure the Committee addresses any necessary environmental issues.

**New Business**

***Known Items:***

There were no known items for discussion.

***Unknown Items:***

There were no unknown items for discussion.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows: To Be Announced

Authorized Costs	06/10/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Routine Revision	06/10/04	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	06/16/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	06/16/04	Following	Administrative Board
IPole Committee	06/16/04	Following	Operating Committee

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Dell adjourned the meeting at 11:35 a.m., until June 16, 2004.

---

Ms. Kathleen Dell, President

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

**Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3  
San Dimas, CA 91773  
Phone (909) 592-4001  
Fax (909) 592-4636

June 16, 2004

A regular meeting of the **Administrative Board** took place on the above date, at 9:00 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena
Mr. Mike Zornes	Adelphia Communications
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS
Mr. Robert Allen	City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Kathleen Dell	AT&T Wireless
Mr. Randy Kilgore	AT&T Wireless
Ms. Norine Luker	NextG Networks
Mr. Charles Vranek	Cingular Wireless
Mr. Thomas Dailey	City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Paula Haney	Verizon California
Mr. Mike Bogner	Sprint L.P.
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff

Via conference call:

Mr. Bob Wolfe	SBC-Pacific Bell
---------------	------------------

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Ms. Dell called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m., and allowed for introductions.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Ms. Dell asked the members to review the minutes of the May 19, 2004 Board meeting. After the members reviewed the minutes, Ms. Dell inquired if there were any corrections, additions or deletions to the minutes. Ms. Prescott noted that in the Discussion Calendar, there was a typo in the percentage of opposition. Ms.

Baccus noted the correction. Ms. Goetz motioned to approve the May 19, 2004 minutes as corrected. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which upon voting, passed unanimously.

### **MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Baccus reported that the gross operating expenses for May 2004 totaled \$41,428.86. The members were assessed this amount.

### **COMMUNICATIONS:**

Ms. Baccus reported that Newpath Networks located in Seattle, Washington has applied for Committee membership. Ms. Baccus read the communication letter to the members, and reported that the JPC office has responded to the letter by sending Newpath Networks the necessary documents for member application.

Ms. Baccus reported that the JPC office has received the bankruptcy settlement from MCI WorldCom. The settlement paid .29 cents to the dollar. The remaining balance of \$2,275.82 has been written off to bad debt for this year. However, MCI remains current on all invoices post petition date.

Next, Ms. Baccus reported that the JPC office has not been notified of the sale of Altrio to Champion Broadband. Therefore, a registered letter has been mailed to Champion Broadband notifying them that they are in default of the 1998 Agreement, which has been signed by Altrio.

Lastly, Ms. Baccus stated that the JPC office has received the reinstatement fee from the City of Vernon. The members would be credited proportionately, and should be reflected in the June assessments.

### **SPECIAL REPORTS**

There were no special reports.

**SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

**ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements**

Chairperson, Ms. Goetz reported that Authorized Costs did not meet in May.

**Operating Committee**

Chairman, Mr. Brown reported that Operating Committee did meet in May, (please refer to the minutes for further details).

**ad hoc Committee on Reorganization**

Chairperson, Ms. Prouty was not in attendance.

**Routine Revision Committee**

Chairperson, Ms. Prescott reported that Routine Revision did meet in May (Please refer to the minutes for further details).

**iPole ad hoc Committee**

Chairperson, Ms. Luker reported that iPole met in May (please refer to the minutes for further details).

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

There were no items for consent.

**DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

There were no items for discussion.

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1280: Authorized Signatures – RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1341: Storm Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1343: Routine Revision – ROUTINE REVISION
- Item 1346: iPole Sharing with NCJPC - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1349: Review Initial Membership Fee - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1356: Review of By-Laws - RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1358: PG&E Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1359: City of Vernon Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1360: Crane Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS

Item 1361: Removal of Ivy - AUTHORIZED COSTS  
Item 1362: City of Banning Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE  
Item 1365: Concrete/Asphalt Break - AUTHORIZED COSTS  
Item 1366: Review Anchor, Overhead and Down Guys - AUTHORIZED COSTS  
Item 1367: T-Mobile Membership Application- OPERATING COMMITTEE  
Item 1368: Evaluation Period Review - OPERATING COMMITTEE

### **Open Administrative Board Items**

Item 1339– *Environmental Issues*

This item remains open as an ongoing issue to ensure the Committee addresses any necessary environmental issues.

### **New Business**

#### ***Known Items:***

There were no known items for discussion.

#### ***Unknown Items:***

Ms. Goetz stated that she would like to note that **Authorized Costs 91** is reflecting an incorrect cost. Ms. Baccus responded that she would review the costs.

### **Bee Nesting in Fiberglass poles – Verizon California**

Ms. Haney reported that she received a report from the Verizon Santa Barbara office, stating that they are experiencing a problem with bee infestation on fiberglass poles. Mr. Allen reported that there are plug kits available to allow covering pre-drilled holes that are open. Mr. Wolfe stated that when a pole is set, open holes should be filled. Mr. Allen stated that when DWP is aware that SBC may opt to attach to their composite fiberglass poles, they normally order them pre-drilled. In his opinion this matter should be discussed prior to setting the pole, and an agreement should be reached by both parties. Ms. Dell stressed that the issue is that poles with pre-drilled holes, if not stepped should be plugged. Mr. Allen questioned Verizon as to why they do not plug the holes when they attach to the poles. Ms. Dell stated that if the exposed holes are in the power area of the poles, communication is not allowed in power space. Ms. Haney added that since Verizon does not set fiberglass poles, they would have no need to carry plug kits in inventory. It was agreed that the issue of unplugged holes should be addressed at the initial preliminary JPA process prior to members approval. The holes should be either stepped, or plugged. Ms. Haney concluded that if the Verizon Santa Barbara office is experiencing this problem, there certainly must be other areas that are, or

could in the future, encounter this issue. Therefore, she is of the opinion that the members should be aware of this problem.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Authorized Costs	07/14/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Routine Revision	07/14/04	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	07/21/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	07/21/04	Following	Administrative Board
Reorganization	07/21/04	Following	Operating Committee
IPole Committee	To	Be	Announced

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Dell adjourned the meeting at 10:155 a.m., until July 21, 2004.

---

Ms. Kathleen Dell, President

---

Jean Baccus, Billing Associate Level IV

**Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3  
San Dimas, CA 91773  
Phone (909) 592-4001  
Fax (909) 592-4636

July 21, 2004

A regular meeting of the **Administrative Board** took place on the above date, at 9:00 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Ernie Solorzano	Southern California Edison
Mr. Mahendra Garg	City of Anaheim
Mr. Doug Schmaderer	City of Pasadena
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS
Mr. Robert Allen	City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Kathleen Dell	AT&T Wireless
Ms. Velma Prouty	SBC – Pacific Bell
Ms. Norine Luker	NextG Networks
Mr. Charles Vranek	Cingular Wireless
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Paula Haney	Verizon California
Mr. Michael Rutledge	Sprint L.P.
Mr. Mike Bogner	Sprint L.P.
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Ms. Dell called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m., and allowed for introductions.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Ms. Dell asked the members to review the minutes of the June 16, 2004 Board meeting. After the members reviewed the minutes, Ms. Dell inquired if there were any corrections, additions or deletions to the minutes. There were no corrections, additions, or deletions. Mr. Walls motioned to approve the June 16, 2004 minutes as written. Ms. Prouty seconded the motion, which upon voting, passed unanimously.

## **MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella announced that Ms. Jocelyn Tiangco is in attendance as an observer. Ms. Tiangco is undergoing training to act as backup to Ms. Corella in her absence.

Ms. Corella reported that the gross operating expenses for June 2004 totaled \$50,114.93. The members were assessed \$30,842.02. The difference between the June operating expenses and the member assessments is due to the credit received from the reinstatement fee from the City of Vernon.

## **COMMUNICATIONS:**

### *Altrio Communications/Champion Broadband*

Ms. Corella reported on the response she received from Mr. Mark Haverkate, CEO for Champion Broadband, to the correspondence she had sent to Mr. Peter Sullivan, consultant for Altrio/Champion. Ms. Corella spoke via telephone to Mr. Haverkate. He informed her that Champion Broadband had only purchased Altrio assets, and did not acquire any liabilities. In her opinion, it appears that all debts must be collected directly from Altrio. He further informed Ms. Corella that Champion does not intend on maintaining Committee membership. Champion is choosing to handle joint pole transactions via tenant/lease agreements. Ms. Corella reported that Mr. Haverkate has offered to attend a Board meeting to discuss this issue with the members. Ms. Corella stated that in her opinion, Champion is a Colorado based communications entity, and is unaware how the Joint Pole Committee operates in regards to joint pole ownership. She reported that this issue would be discussed in depth at the following Operating meeting. Mr. Solorzano reported that he spoke with Mr. Haverkate. In his opinion, and in the best interest of the Committee members, it would be beneficial to transact business with Champion through third party agreements. Ms. Dell stated if Champion is stating that they acquired Altrio assets, in her opinion the Committee membership, and the entire system are assets. Furthermore, she stated that the members have the right to remove their facilities, although the Committee is not in the habit of taking this type of action. She stated the primary issue is how the Committee, as a group, plan on handling this situation. Mr. Solorzano stated that SCE has not received payment from Altrio JPAs that had been finalized through Form 44's. Mr. Solorzano stated that a primary focus for discussion is how are those members due payment from Altrio, going to collect before the possibility of Altrio filing for bankruptcy. He further stated that SCE inspected two cities, and if visually they were unattached, those JPAs were cancelled via a Form 7 however; any JPAs that were discovered to have facilities attached, were left intact. The consensus was to discuss this issue in depth, and arrive at a resolution on how to handle this issue at the following Operating meeting.

### *City of Banning/PG&E Reinstatements*

Ms. Corella reported that the reinstatement extension period of June 30, 2004 has expired for the City of Banning. A correspondence was sent to Banning as a reminder that the period for member reinstatement has expired. Should they desire Committee membership in the future, they need to apply for membership as an incoming applicant.

Ms. Corella reported that the reinstatement period for PG&E has been extended until August 31, 2004. She further reported that she is in communication with Mr. Steve Grimes, therefore; they continue to display an interest in returning to the Committee. Mr. Grimes would be meeting with upper management within his organization to discuss reinstatement.

Lastly, Ms. Corella reported that she received a phone call from a contractor engaged by Disney Corporation that is working on a project in the City of Glendale. Their intent is to remove poles in an area in Glendale, and replace them with underground facilities. Disney would like to contact those joint owners on the poles being replaced and compensate them for their poles. Ms. Corella stated that she directed him to Mr. Tony Mai, the representative for the City of Glendale. She further stated that she was unsure of how this type of situation is handled. Ms. Dell responded that the contractor should be in contact with the City of Glendale. Ms. Corella stated that since some of the members might be affected, she wanted to notify them of this intent.

### **SPECIAL REPORTS**

There were no special reports.

### **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

#### **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements**

Chairman, Mr. Solorzano reported that Authorized Costs did not meet in June 2004.

#### **Operating Committee**

Chairman, Mr. Brown reported that Operating Committee did meet in June 2004, (please refer to the minutes for further details).

### **ad hoc Committee on Reorganization**

Chairperson, Ms. Prouty reported that Reorganization did not meet in June 2004, however; would meet following the Board.

### **Routine Revision Committee**

Chairperson, Ms. Prescott reported that Routine Revision did meet in June 2004 (Please refer to the minutes for further details).

### **iPole ad hoc Committee**

Chairperson, Ms. Luker reported that iPole met in June 2004 (please refer to the minutes for further details). She further reported that there was an iPole conference call in July to determine which members were unable to connect to the database.

### **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

There were no items for consent.

### **DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

Item 1343: Routine Review – Section 1-5

The Routine Revision ad hoc committee had emailed their proposed revisions for Sections 1 through 5 to all members prior to the Board meeting (See attachment A). The members reviewed the proposed revisions and there were no issues. Ms. Dell solicited a motion to approve the proposals. Mr. Allen motioned to move Item 1343 to the Consent Calendar. Ms. Haney motioned to accept and approve the proposed Routine revisions to Sections 1 through 5. Ms. Thomas seconded the motion, which upon voting passed. Mr. Rutledge abstained. Ms. Dell reported that the goal for Routine Revision Item 1343 is to approve a block of sections at future Board meetings, and publish the entire revised Routine Handbook by the end of this year.

### **OTHER ITEMS: Unfinished Business**

Item 1280: Authorized Signatures – RE-ORGANIZATION

Item 1332: DWP Multi-Member Codes - OPERATING COMMITTEE

Item 1341: Storm Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS

Item 1343: Routine Revision – ROUTINE REVISION

Item 1346: iPole Sharing with NCJPC - OPERATING COMMITTEE  
Item 1349: Review Initial Membership Fee - OPERATING COMMITTEE  
Item 1356: Review of By-Laws - RE-ORGANIZATION  
Item 1358: PG&E Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE  
Item 1360: Crane Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS  
Item 1361: Removal of Ivy - AUTHORIZED COSTS  
Item 1365: Concrete/Asphalt Break - AUTHORIZED COSTS  
Item 1366: Review Anchor, Overhead and Down Guys - AUTHORIZED COSTS  
Item 1367: T-Mobile Membership Application- OPERATING COMMITTEE  
Item 1369: Newpath Networks Membership Application - OPERATING COMMITTEE

Item 1365: Concrete/Asphalt Break

Mr. Walls reported that the purpose of this proposed authorized cost item 10 (d) is for the benefit of the utility that sets a pole in concrete. The setting utility breaks the concrete, sets the pole, and then must repair the break out around the pole temporarily with asphalt. Then utility number two transfers their facilities, removes the old pole, breaks the temporary asphalt and handles the permanent concrete repair. The issue is that the setting utility does not recoup the cost of the initial break and temporary asphalt repair. Therefore, Mr. Walls is proposing a recovery cost for concrete break and temporary repair (See Attachment B). Mr. Walls motioned to move Item 1365 to the Consent Calendar for Board approval. Mr. Solorzano seconded the motion. Ms. Haney and Ms. Prouty opposed the motion; therefore, the motion did not carry. Ms. Dell inquired if the members would choose to move the item to Discussion. Ms. Haney responded that she is of the opinion that this item requires further discussion, and should be on the Discussion Calendar. She would also like to discuss this issue within her organization for clarification. Ms. Prouty stated that she would also like to review this item within her organization as well. Mr. Brown stated that he agrees with Ms. Haney and Ms. Prouty, in that this item should be discussed further. He further stated that he does not disagree with the proposal, however, all costs should be discussed extensively due to the impact on the members and their respective budgets. After some discussion the consensus was to return this item to Authorized Costs for further extensive discussion within the ad hoc committee.

Item 1339- *Environmental Issues*

This item remains open as an ongoing issue to ensure the Committee addresses any necessary environmental issues.

**New Business**

***Known Items:***

Ms. Dell reported that she has a concern with the **pole inspection records**. She stated that it is her understanding that in regards to Edison inspections, the process is as follows: (1) Edison sends a pre-list of poles to the utilities, (2) the utilities then verify their respective pole records, and (3) after the utilities have verified the pre-list and approved it, then the JPAs are sent to the JPC office for processing. It has been reported to her that Edison would no longer send a pre-list to the utilities. Mr. Solorzano responded that according to his knowledge, the utilities should be receiving a pole inspection pre-list. The JPC office also receives a pre-list copy for verification, then returns the corrected list to Edison. Edison bills only those poles that remain on the verified list. **The consensus was that Verizon California, SBC, and AT&T Wireless requires a pole inspection pre-list from Edison.** Edison has agreed to send the aforementioned utilities a list for verification.

***Unknown Items:***

Mr. Solorzano reported that are multiple fires in various areas where there are SCE poles with facilities that are being damaged. He stated that the related JPAs, where the damage must be immediately repaired, would be sent to joint members with the Form 48 attached as previously agreed among the members. He would like to notify those members that may be involved in this type scenario. Mr. Solorzano stated that the members have agreed that in certain conditions, members would receive a JPA with the Form 48 attached. Some cases would be a pole hit by a car, pole damaged by fire, and pole damage from windstorm conditions. These multiple fire conditions fall under these conditions. Ms. Thomas reported that in two instances her office received JPAs with a Form 48 attached, and the JPA did not fall under the above-mentioned conditions. Mr. Solorzano requested Ms. Thomas provide him with the documents and he would research the issue.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Authorized Costs	08/11/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Routine Revision	08/11/04	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	08/18/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	08/18/04	Following	Administrative Board
Reorganization	08/18/04	Following	Operating Committee
IPole Committee	08/18/04	Following	Reorganization

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Dell adjourned the meeting at 10:30 a.m., until August 18, 2004.

---

Ms. Kathleen Dell, President

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

(attachments to follow)

**2004 ROUTINE HANDBOOK CHANGES      ATTACHMENT A**

**Sections 1 through 5**

**Index**                      No Changes

**Glossary**                      No Changes

**Section 1**                      Section 1.0 Scope - Change in Agreement date from 1995 to "1998"

Section 1.2 Special Agreement - The last sentence in the Section was deleted as it stated "This Section must be used when poles other than wood are placed, or replaced". The deletion was due to the fact that pole prices have been established in the Handbook for poles other than wood. A sentence was also added to the end of the paragraph to note that "Section 18.1D does not apply". Automatic approval may not apply to a JPA under Special Agreement.

**Section 2**                      No Changes

**Section 3**                      The title at the top of the page was changed to "JOINT PLANNING PRACTICE".

Section 3.0 Joint Planning Practice - The title of this Section was changed to read "Notice of Intention to Construct". The timeframe was changed from 30 days to 45 days in four locations within this Section.

Section 3.1 Purchase of Interest Under Notice of Intention – This Section was rewritten for clarity and some verbiage specific to anchorage was deleted.

Section 3.2 Penalty for Rejection of Notice of Intention - The title of this Section was changed to read "Rejection of Notice of Intention". The timeframe was changed from 30 days to 45 days.

Section 3.3 Penalty for Failure to Issue Notice of Intention - This Section was rewritten to more clearly define the failure, time period and penalty. The title of the Section was also changed to "Failure to Issue Notice of Intention".

Section 3.4 Notice of Intention to Construct Underground Facilities or Risers - This Section was rewritten to eliminate the notification for underground facilities, as the Form J.U. 50 does not appear to be in use today. The title of the Section was also changed to "Notice of Intention to Construct Risers".

Section 3.10 Placement of Pole for Private Party or Governmental Agency under Notice of Intent - This Section was added to establish a procedure for new construction of a pole for a Private Party or Governmental Agency.

Section 3.14 Notice of Intention to Place Other Than Wood Pole - This Section was added to establish a routine for placing composite poles, other than wood.

## 2004 ROUTINE HANDBOOK CHANGES

### Sections 1 through 5

**Section 4**     Section 4.0 Purchase or Sale of Interest - In the first sentence of the first paragraph, the words “or equipment” were deleted. The remaining verbiage is unchanged.

Section 4.4 Purchase of Interest at Same Grade – At the end of the first paragraph a sentence was added “Refer to Authorized Cost Items 160 or 164”.

Section 4.14 Purchase of Interest in Other than Wood Pole – This Section was added to establish a procedure for purchasing composite poles using the established Pole Prices.

**Section 5**     No Changes

## **2004 ROUTINE HANDBOOK CHANGES**

### **Sections 1 through 5**

#### SECTION 3.1 - CURRENT

##### **3.1 Purchase of Interest Under Notice of Intention**

If constructing Member under Notice of Intention is involved in expense exceeding that required for its facilities when alone, purchase of interest by Member desiring to participate in future joint ownership shall be made when poles and anchors have been installed according to approved plan. Where only the associated anchorage is increased by request, purchase in the anchorage may be recorded as a prior transaction to the pole. In no case shall purchase in poles be required until attachment is needed, when length of poles has not been increased.

The cost of a push brace associated with a jointly owned pole shall be shared equally by all joint owners.

#### SECTION 3.1 - PROPOSED

##### **3.1 Purchase of Interest Under Notice of Intention**

If constructing Member, to accommodate other members' requirements, is involved in expense exceeding that required for its facilities when alone, purchase of interest by Member desiring to participate in joint ownership shall be made when poles and anchors have been installed according to approved plan.

The cost of a push brace associated with a jointly owned pole shall be shared equally by all joint owners.

## **2004 ROUTINE HANDBOOK CHANGES**

### **Sections 1 through 5**

#### SECTION 3.3 - CURRENT

##### **3.3 Penalty for Failure to Issue Notice of Intention**

If any Member places pole(s) or anchor(s) without Notice of Intention and within three years from year of installation of pole and equipment another Member requires facilities in same location, and installed pole does not adequately provide for these facilities, replacement shall be made in accordance with Section 7.11. Anchor replacements are also subject to penalty. After this three year period there shall be no penalty for failure to issue Notice of Intention and replacement shall be made in accordance with rules of the Routine as provided by the conditions existent at that time. The three-year period referred to herein shall begin with January 1 following date of installation.

#### SECTION 3.3 - PROPOSED

##### **3.3 Failure to Issue Notice of Intention**

If any Member places pole(s) or anchor(s) without issuing a Notice of Intention (Sec. 3.0) that Member may be subject to penalty. During a period of three years beginning the year of installation another Member requiring facilities in the same location shall request replacement of facilities to provide for Incumbent LEC (Local Exchange Carrier) and Electric Utility Member. All associated costs for such replacement in accordance with Sec 7.11 shall be at the sole expense of the Member in offense. There shall be no expense after the “three year” period.

## **2004 ROUTINE HANDBOOK CHANGES**

### **Sections 1 through 5**

#### SECTION 3.4 - CURRENT

##### **Notice of Intention to Construct Underground Facilities or Risers**

Members proposing installation of facilities can prepare and submit to all Members operating in the same area, Form J.U. 50 for underground and Form 7 or Preliminary JPA for risers, notifying the Members of their intention to construct (See examples in Section 18). J.U. 50 can be used for all projects. Example: Bridges and river crossings or projects with estimated excessive trenching or paving cost.

Note: Section 3.4 is a non-billable section.

#### SECTION 3.4 - PROPOSED

##### **Notice of Intention to Construct Risers**

Members proposing installation of facilities shall prepare and submit to all owners on record a Form 7 or Preliminary JPA for risers, notifying the Members of their intention to construct (See examples in Section 18)

If Member proposing installation of facilities is an existing owner on record, a Form 7 shall be prepared and submitted.

If Member proposing installation of facilities is not an existing owner on record, a Preliminary JPA shall be prepared and submitted.

Note: Section 3.4 is a non-billable section.

## **2004 ROUTINE HANDBOOK CHANGES**

### **Sections 1 through 5**

#### **NEW SECTIONS IN SECTION 3**

##### **SECTION 3.10 - PROPOSED**

#### **3.10 Placement of Pole for Private Party or Governmental Agency under Notice of Intention**

In general, any private party or governmental agency causing a pole to be installed shall pay all expense in connection therewith. However, certain conditions require special consideration, and no commitment shall be made by any member until all incumbent utilities have mutually agreed as to the conditions applicable.

If construction is started without notification, the Member initiating the work will be responsible for all construction costs incurred by other incumbent members. When all Members have agreed as to the basis of settlement and have received authority from such private party or governmental agency to proceed with the work, one of the Members shall install the pole and sell interest in the new pole to each Member concerned. Each Member shall attach its facilities, and upon completion of the work, each Member, as it may have elected to charge for cost of its work, shall bill the said party for its share of the cost of installation.

##### **SECTION 3.14 - PROPOSED**

#### **3.14 Notice of Intention to Place Other than Wood Pole**

If constructing Member, to accommodate other members' requirements, is involved in expense exceeding that required for its facilities when alone, purchase of interest by Member desiring to participate in joint ownership shall be made when poles and anchors have been installed according to approved plan.

## 2004 ROUTINE HANDBOOK CHANGES

### Sections 1 through 5

#### NEW SECTION IN SECTION 4

#### SECTION 4.14 - PROPOSED

##### **4.14 – Purchase of Interest in Other than Wood Pole**

Purchase or sale of interest in pole shall be initiated on a Joint Pole Authorization and shall be approved by all Members concerned. The interest and price applying thereto shall be in accordance with Routine and schedule of structural values or other Authorized Costs and date Joint Pole Authorization is issued, unless otherwise agreed.

Any extension of line conductors by one Member upon one or more poles of another Member in any direction shall constitute a longitudinal line extension and all poles in such extension shall require purchase of interest, except as otherwise provided under Section 9.0.

Additionally, the following cases shall require purchase:

- (a) Pole used for supporting line conductors
- (b) Pole used exclusively for services
- (c) Pole on which service is run to underground
- (d) Pole used for supporting street light wire
- (e) Pole used exclusively for guys
- (f) Pole used for guying with supporting guy to anchorage
- (g) Poles where guys are extended from pole to pole involving more than one span
- (h) Pole space used for supporting hardware, which occupies useable space.

**NOTE 1:** Purchase of entire interest shall be at structural value.

**NOTE 2:** For purchase into anchors, refer to Section 12.3.

**ATTACHMENT B**

New Proposed Item 10(d)

Concrete break and temporary repair with asphalt.

The method used to calculate was to calculate the average between Item 10(a) and 10(b).

10(a)	\$246.00
10(b)	<u>+\$ 90.00</u>
	\$336.00

$\$336.00/2 = \$168.00$

Item 10(d) proposal

Title: **Concrete break and temporary repair with asphalt.**

Cost: **\$168.00.**

**Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3  
San Dimas, CA 91773  
Phone (909) 592-4001  
Fax (909) 592-4636

August 18, 2004

A regular meeting of the **Administrative Board** took place on the above date, at 9:00 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Mahendra Garg	City of Anaheim
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena
Mr. Doug Schmaderer	City of Pasadena
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS
Ms. Kathleen Dell	AT&T Wireless
Ms. Velma Prouty	SBC – Pacific Bell
Ms. Norine Luker	NextG Networks
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Paula Haney	Verizon California
Mr. Tibor Laky	Sprint L.P.
Ms. Monica Gonzalez	Southern California Edison
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Ms. Dell called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Ms. Dell asked the members to review the minutes of the July 21, 2004 Board meeting. Ms. Prouty stated that she had contacted Ms. Corella with her noted corrections. Ms. Corella responded that the corrections have been made. After the members reviewed the minutes, Ms. Dell inquired if there were any further corrections, additions or deletions to the minutes. There were no further corrections, additions, or deletions. Ms. Haney motioned to approve the July 21, 2004 minutes as corrected. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which upon voting, passed unanimously.

## **MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the gross operating expenses for July 2004 totaled \$43,975.26. The members were assessed this amount. July is reflecting a below average month.

## **COMMUNICATIONS:**

### ***Altrio Communications/Champion Broadband***

Ms. Corella reported that at the last Board meeting, the members had agreed to send correspondence to Champion Boardband requesting a formal letter stating that they choose not to participate in the Committee, and how they intend on handling joint pole transactions. She then read the letter to the attending members (see attachment 1). Ms. Corella reported that she received a phone response to her letter from Mr. Mark Haverkate. In the conversation, Ms. Corella stressed to Mr. Haverkate, that the Committee would like some form of notification on their stance in regards to Committee membership. She then read the letter sent to Mr. Peter Sullivan of Argus Consulting in regards to the sale of Altrio to Champion Broadband (see attachment 2). She reported that she has not received a response from Mr. Sullivan. Ms. Corella's next step in the process of contacting Altrio was to visit the Department of Corporations web site. She contacted someone at the Department who informed her that there are legal services that could aide in searching for Altrio. Ms. Corella has obtained the Altrio corporate number which can be used in the search. She contacted a legal service that stated in the search she could obtain information on all transactions by Altrio. The fee for the service is \$250.00. Ms. Corella stated that another option for the Committee in attempting to locate Altrio is to contact Committee legal counsel. She stated that this issue would be discussed in depth at the following Operating meeting.

### ***T-Mobile***

Ms. Corella reported that she received a phone call from the legal department for T-Mobile. They inquired about membership, and reported to Ms. Corella that T-Mobile would be acquiring some Cingular sites. They questioned that in acquiring Cingular, would they be acquiring membership, therefore, membership application would not be required. Ms. Corella reported that she responded it would most likely depend on the conditions of the sale. She stated that this matter would need to be addressed by the members when the Cingular acquisition by T-Mobile transpires.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

There were no special reports.

## **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

### **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements**

Chairperson, Ms. Goetz reported that Authorized Costs did not meet in July 2004, but did meet in the current month (refer to the minutes for details).

### **Operating Committee**

Chairman, Mr. Brown reported that Operating Committee did meet in July 2004, (please refer to the minutes for further details).

### **ad hoc Committee on Reorganization**

Chairperson, Ms. Prouty reported that Reorganization did not meet in July 2004, however; would meet following the Board. The focus of Reorganization is to review the current By-Laws and propose any revisions if necessary.

### **Routine Revision Committee**

Chairperson, Ms. Prescott reported that Routine Revision did meet in July 2004 (Please refer to the minutes for further details).

### **iPole ad hoc Committee**

Chairperson, Ms. Luker reported that iPole did not meet in July 2004. However, the iPole ad hoc committee would meet following Operating and Reorganization.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

There were no items for consent.

**DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

*Item 1366: Review Anchor, Overhead and Down Guys – Proposed Authorized Costs.*

Authorized Costs Chairperson, Ms. Goetz reported that this item has been pulled from the Discussion calendar and would be returned to the ad hoc committee for further review and discussion.

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1280: Authorized Signatures – RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1332: DWP Multi-Member Codes - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1341: Storm Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1343: Routine Revision – ROUTINE REVISION
- Item 1346: iPole Sharing with NCJPC - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1349: Review Initial Membership Fee - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1356: Review of By-Laws - RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1358: PG&E Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1360: Crane Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1361: Removal of Ivy - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1365: Concrete/Asphalt Break - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1366: Review Anchor, Overhead and Down Guys - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1367: T-Mobile Membership Application- OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1369: Newpath Networks Membership Application - OPERATING COMMITTEE

*Item 1365: Concrete/Asphalt Break*

This item was closed in the ad hoc committee. The members agreed that Authorized Cost Item 10 (a) would address the issue of concrete/asphalt break.

*Item 1369: Newpath Networks Membership Application*

Ms. Dell reported that she believes the reason Newpath Networks has not responded to the Committee is that they have not received their CPCN yet from the CPUC.

Item 1339– *Environmental Issues*

This item remains open as an ongoing issue to ensure the Committee addresses any necessary environmental issues.

**New Business**

***Known Items:***

Ms. Corella reported that a new item number for the 2005 pole prices has been assigned to the ad hoc Authorized Costs committee. It is **Item 1370: 2005 Pole Prices**. Ms. Dell added that the pole price matrix has been reviewed and revised extensively by the Authorized Costs committee, therefore, the objective is to arrive at approved pole prices at the appropriate time of year-end.

Ms. Prouty stated that she would like all the members to have clarification in regards to members finalizing other members JPAs via Item 14 of Authorized Costs. The Form 7 notifying utility A that utility B will finalize their JPA per Section 18.1f, must be attached to the JPA when submitting the final to the JPC office. If the Form 7 is missing, the JPA will be returned to utility B by the JPC office.

***Unknown Items:***

There were no unknown items.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Authorized Costs	09/09/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Routine Revision	09/09/04	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	09/15/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	09/15/04	Following	Administrative Board
Reorganization	09/15/04	Following	Operating Committee
IPole Committee	09/14/04	Following	Reorganization

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Dell adjourned the meeting at 10:25 a.m., until September 15, 2004.

---

Ms. Kathleen Dell, President

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

**Attachment 1**

Southern California Joint Pole Committee  
437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3  
San Dimas, CA 91773  
Phone (909) 592-4001  
Fax (909) 592-4636

August 4, 2004

Mr. Mark Haverkate  
Champion Broadband  
380 Perry Street Suite 230  
Castle Rock, CO 80104

RE: Southern California Joint Pole Committee Membership

Dear Mr. Haverkate:

I am writing on behalf of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee. At our last Administrative Board meeting, I reported on our conversation that transpired last month. I reported that your organization has chosen not to acquire Committee membership. I informed the members that your organization has acquired Altrio assets, but not any liabilities. Please take note that Altrio paid an initial membership fee of \$37,935.00 in August 2001. There is a possibility that this cost is appearing as a long-term asset on Altrio's balance sheet. According to the 1998 Agreement, should a member withdraw, or the Committee disorganizes, all members are entitled to compensation from the initial fee deposit. However, since it is your decision not to maintain membership, the Committee is requesting a formal letter stating so, and how you plan on transacting future joint pole transactions with the member utilities.

Should there be any questions, feel free to contact me directly at (909) 592-4001 Ex 12

Cordially,  
Jennie Corella  
Office Manager

ADELPHIA CABLE COMMUNICATIONS  
ALTRIO COMMUNICATIONS INC.  
COMCAST CABLE (AT&T BROADBAND)  
AT&T COMM. OF CALIF., INC.  
AT&T LOCAL SERV/TCG  
AT&T WIRELESS  
CINGULAR WIRELESS (PBW)  
CITY OF ANAHEIM  
CITY OF AZUSA  
CITY OF BURBANK

CITY OF COLTON  
CITY OF GLENDALE  
CITY OF LOMPOC  
CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
CITY OF PASADENA  
CITY OF RIVERSIDE  
CITY OF VERNON  
ICG COMMUNICATIONS  
MCI METRO/ATS  
MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS

NEXTEL COMMUNICATIONS  
NEXTG NETWORKS OF CALIFORNIA  
SBC PACIFIC BELL  
SOUTHERN CALIF. EDISON CO.  
SOUTHERN CALIF. WATER CO.  
SPRINT L.P.  
SPRINT PCS  
VERIZON CALIFORNIA, INC.  
VERIZON WIRELESS  
XO COMMUNICATIONS(NEXTLINK)

**Attachment 2**

Southern California Joint Pole Committee  
437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3  
San Dimas, CA 91773  
Phone (909) 592-4001  
Fax (909) 592-4636

August 4, 2004

Mr. Peter Sullivan/Argus Consulting  
C/O Champion Broadband  
2702 Media Center Drive  
Los Angeles, CA 90065

RE: Altrio Sale to Champion Broadband

Dear Mr. Sullivan:

I am writing on behalf of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee. The Committee members are requesting a copy of the sales transaction that transpired between Altrio Communications and Champion Broadband. The sale document is necessary in order to aide the members in deciding how to handle prior Altrio transactions.

According to the 1998 Committee Agreement, members choosing to withdrawn their membership must inform the Committee. If you have any access to Altrio, I would be grateful if you could give me a contact name, address and phone number in that I may request a formal letter of withdrawal from any one of their officers. I would very much appreciate your prompt attention to these requests. You may contact me directly via phone at (909) 592-4001 ex 12, or via mail at the above address.

Should there be any questions, feel free to contact me directly at (909) 592-4001 Ex 12

Cordially,

Jennie Corella  
Office Manager

ADELPHIA CABLE COMMUNICATIONS  
ALTRIO COMMUNICATIONS INC.  
COMCAST CABLE (AT&T BROADBAND)  
AT&T COMM. OF CALIF., INC.  
AT&T LOCAL SERV/TCG  
AT&T WIRELESS  
CINGULAR WIRELESS (PBW)  
CITY OF ANAHEIM  
CITY OF AZUSA  
CITY OF BURBANK

CITY OF COLTON  
CITY OF GLENDALE  
CITY OF LOMPOC  
CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
CITY OF PASADENA  
CITY OF RIVERSIDE  
CITY OF VERNON  
ICG COMMUNICATIONS  
MCI METRO/ATS  
MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS

NEXTEL COMMUNICATIONS  
NEXTG NETWORKS OF CALIFORNIA  
SBC PACIFIC BELL  
SOUTHERN CALIF. EDISON CO.  
SOUTHERN CALIF. WATER CO.  
SPRINT L.P.  
SPRINT PCS  
VERIZON CALIFORNIA, INC.  
VERIZON WIRELESS  
XO COMMUNICATIONS(NEXTLINK)

**Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3  
San Dimas, CA 91773  
Phone (909) 592-4001  
Fax (909) 592-4636

September 15, 2004

A regular meeting of the **Administrative Board** took place on the above date, at 9:00 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Mahendra Garg	City of Anaheim
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena
Mr. Charles Vranek	Cingular Wireless
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS
Ms. Kathleen Dell	AT&T Wireless
Ms. Velma Prouty	SBC – Pacific Bell
Mr. Robert Allen	City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Paula Haney	Verizon California
Mr. Tibor Laky	Sprint L.P.
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

Via Conference Call:

Ms. Norine Luker	NextG Networks
------------------	----------------

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Ms. Dell called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Ms. Dell asked the members to review the minutes of the August 18, 2004 Board meeting. After the members reviewed the minutes, Ms. Dell inquired if there were any corrections, additions or deletions to the minutes. Mr. Garg stated that there was a typo on page two, paragraph two. Ms. Corella noted the typo. There were no further corrections, additions, or deletions. Ms. Haney motioned to approve the August 18, 2004 minutes as corrected. Ms. Prouty seconded the motion, which upon voting, passed unanimously.

## **MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the gross operating expenses for August 2004 totaled \$43,625.75. The members were assessed this amount. August is reflecting a below average month.

## **COMMUNICATIONS:**

### ***Steve Grimes – PG&E***

Ms. Corella reported that she received an email from Mr. Grimes. Ms. Corella read the message to the members. In the message, Mr. Grimes is requesting an extension until March 31, 2005. The members discussed the request from PG&E. The consensus is to grant PG&E their requested extension, because they are displaying a good faith interest in reinstatement by continuing to communicate with the SCJPC.

Ms. Dell requested a report on the total dollars transacted within the JPC office in one month. She inquired if any other members would like a copy of the report. No other members displayed an interest in the report. Ms. Dell stated that this report would place a value on JPC transactions.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

There were no special reports.

## **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

### **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements**

Chairperson, Ms. Goetz reported that Authorized Costs met in August 2004, and that pole prices are due September 15, 2004. She further reported that if members prices are not received by the due date, those member would default to the approved weighted-average cost (please refer to the minutes for any further details).

### **Operating Committee**

Chairman, Mr. Brown reported that the Operating Committee did meet in August 2004, (please refer to the minutes for further details).

### **ad hoc Committee on Reorganization**

Chairperson, Ms. Prouty reported that Reorganization met in August 2004, and would meet following the Board. The focus of Reorganization is to review the current By-Laws and propose any revisions if necessary.

### **Routine Revision Committee**

Chairperson, Ms. Prescott reported that Routine Revision did meet in August 2004 (Please refer to the minutes for further details).

### **iPole ad hoc Committee**

Ms. Dell reported that iPole met September 14, 2004, and would be discussed later in the meeting under Known Items.

### **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

There were no items for consent.

### **DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

There were no items for discussion.

### **OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1280: Authorized Signatures – RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1332: DWP Multi-Member Codes - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1341: Storm Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1343: Routine Revision – ROUTINE REVISION
- Item 1346: iPole Sharing with NCJPC - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1349: Review Initial Membership Fee - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1356: Review of By-Laws - RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1358: PG&E Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1360: Crane Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1361: Removal of Ivy - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1366: Review Anchor, Overhead and Down Guys - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1367: T-Mobile Membership Application- OPERATING COMMITTEE

Item 1369: Newpath Networks Membership Application - OPERATING COMMITTEE  
Item 1370: 2005 Pole Prices  
Item 1371: 2005 Salary Survey

Ms. Dell inquired if Ms. Corella has received any communication from T-Mobile. Ms. Corella responded that she has not, nor has she received communication from Newpath Networks. Ms. Dell reported that she has been in contact with Newpath Networks, and that perhaps the lack of response on their part could be that they are waiting for their CPCN from the CPUC.

Ms. Dell inquired into Item 1371: Salary Survey. Ms. Corella responded that the objective of this item is to arrive at a fair-market salary range for the positions at the JPC office. She stated that she would be contacting the members, requesting salary data within their respective organizations. She would then take this information and create a comparison chart between the members and the current JPC salaries. However, due her heavy workload, and year-end, Ms. Corella stated that she could not give the members an appropriate time frame for this project. She intends on having the survey completed by the end of first quarter next year.

#### Item 1339- *Environmental Issues*

This item remains open as an ongoing issue to ensure the Committee addresses any necessary environmental issues.

### **New Business**

#### ***Known Items:***

The discussion revolved around the **iPole** meeting. Ms. Luker reported that Joe Atalla met with the ad hoc iPole committee September 14, 2004. She stated that Mr. Atalla is of the opinion that Hyperlink has delivered a product per the original specifications. Prior to continuing with the iPole. Net platform, Mr. Atalla would like the member(s) to review each and every specification, and agree that the specification has been met. The committee informed Mr. Atalla that they would like a monthly invoice with a break down of how the hours were spent in regards to the monthly maintenance. The consensus within the ad hoc committee is to contact a lawyer for direction, and availability of options in relation to the two Hyperlink contracts. Ms. Luker contacted Mr. Adams, the Committee legal counsel, and he has agreed to review the contract (or someone within his firm) and other documents regarding to iPole. His fee should not exceed \$1,000.00. Ms. Luker has drafted the letter to be sent to Mr. Adams along with the pertinent documents. Ms. Dell stated that herself, Ms. Prouty, and Ms. Goetz have volunteered to review the specifications with Mr. Atalla. Ms. Luker responded that in her opinion, it would be wiser to postpone the meeting with Mr. Atalla until after Mr. Adams firm has reviewed the

documents, and given the Committee an evaluation, and some direction. The consensus among the members is the ability to obtain the source code for iPole from Mr. Atalla.

Ms. Luker stressed how valuable the presence of IT people can be when meeting with Hyperlink. She then thanked SCE for bringing their IT person to the meeting. She encourages all members to follow suit. Ms. Prouty suggested that those members that could connect to iPole, such as DWP and Sprint, should attempt to process a JPA from start to finish. The members agreed to send the letter to legal counsel for review by September 16, 2004.

***Unknown Items:***

Mr. Walls is proposing introducing a form for riser notification. It would be titled Form 9 – Riser Notification. The members briefly discussed the proposed form. It was agreed to assign this issue to the ad hoc Routine Revision for review, and proposed language.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Authorized Costs	10/13/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office(tentative)
Routine Revision	10/13/04	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	10/20/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	10/20/04	Following	Administrative Board
Reorganization	10/20/04	Following	Operating Committee
IPole Committee	TO	BE	ANNOUNCED

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Dell adjourned the meeting at 10:40 a.m., until October 20, 2004.

---

Ms. Kathleen Dell, President

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager



4:	5:	6:
7:	8:	9:
10:	11:	12:

**Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3  
San Dimas, CA 91773  
Phone (909) 592-4001  
Fax (909) 592-4636

October 20, 2004

A regular meeting of the **Administrative Board** took place on the above date, at 9:00 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Mahendra Garg	City of Anaheim
Mr. Randall Starkey	Adelphia Cable Communications
Mr. Ernie Solorzano	Southern California Edison
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS
Ms. Velma Prouty	SBC – Pacific Bell
Ms. Paula Haney	Verizon California
Mr. John Rodriguez	Verizon California
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

**CALL TO ORDER:**

In the absence of Ms. Dell, Committee President, Mr. Brown, Committee Vice-President called the meeting to order at 9:25 a.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Mr. Brown asked the members to review the minutes of the September 15, 2004 Board meeting. After the members reviewed the minutes, Mr. Brown inquired if there were any corrections, additions or deletions to the minutes. Ms. Prouty stated that there was a typo on page four, paragraph three. Ms. Corella noted the typo. There were no further corrections, additions, or deletions. Ms. Prouty motioned to approve the September 15, 2004 minutes as corrected. Mr. Garg seconded the motion, which upon voting, passed unanimously.

## **MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the gross operating expenses for September 2004 totaled \$45,511.98. The members were assessed this amount. September is reflecting an average month.

## **COMMUNICATIONS:**

### ***Mr. Roger Adams – Legal Counsel***

Ms. Corella reported that the iPole ad hoc committee had met last week. The consensus was to contact Mr. Adams to review the two Hyperlink Contracts for interpretation, and direction. Mr. Adams referred the Committee request to Mr. Overing, his associate who specializes in software copyrights, patents and ownership. Ms. Corella stated that she would report further on this when she reports on the iPole meeting.

Ms. Corella further reported that she received a phone call from Mr. Brad Cook of Champion Broadband. Mr. Cook stated that he has been assigned to research the number of poles Altrio is attached to, and which are active and inactive. Ms. Corella responded that she could only give him a pole count, and that the respective member utilities could better serve his request. Ms. Corella stated that Mr. Cook could be reached at (323) 908-1383. Mr. Solorzano suggested arranging a meeting with Edison, SBC, City of Pasadena and Mr. Cook to aid Champion in identifying attachments. The above mentioned utilities should compile their pole lists, since the poles are joint and if Champion receives individual lists they will reflect redundancy. Ms. Corella concluded that she questioned Mr. Cook if Champion is considering becoming a member of the Committee. He responded that he did not know at this time, however, Champion would be discussing how to handle their pole attachments in the future.

Lastly, Ms. Corella reported that she attempted to contact Mr. Peter Sullivan of Argus Consultants in regards to the sale of Altrio. Mr. Sullivan has returned to his home office in Boston. He is on vacation and would be returning next week. Ms. Corella further reported that she left a message with his office to return her phone call. She will request information on the sale of Altrio, and whatever information she receives from Mr. Sullivan, she is hoping to report to the members at the next Board meeting. Mr. Solorzano stated that he believes there is a scheduled meeting in Pasadena to discuss Altrio. He believes that the City of Pasadena is contemplating legal action toward Altrio.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

There were no special reports.

**SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

**ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements**

Chairperson, Ms. Goetz reported that Authorized Costs met in September 2004 (please refer to the minutes for any further details).

**Operating Committee**

Chairman, Mr. Brown reported that the Operating Committee did meet in September 2004, (please refer to the minutes for further details).

**ad hoc Committee on Reorganization**

Chairperson, Ms. Prouty reported that Reorganization met in September 2004, and would meet following the Board. The focus of Reorganization is to review the current By-Laws and propose any revisions if necessary.

**Routine Revision Committee**

Chairperson, Ms. Prescott reported that Routine Revision did meet in September 2004 (Please refer to the minutes for further details).

**iPole ad hoc Committee**

Ms. Corella reported that iPole met on Friday, October 15, 2004 with Mr. Mike Overing. Ms. Corella stated that his recommendation would be to re-negotiate a contract with Hyperlink capturing what the Committee is expecting in regards to system maintenance and software development. The consensus is that Edison would arrange a meeting with Mr. Atalla to determine where he is in regards to the software development. Ms. Corella stated that further details of the meeting would be in the minutes.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

There were no items for consent.

## **DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

### *Item 1370: 2005 Pole Prices*

The members initially reviewed the weighted-average for wood poles. In reviewing the weighted-average, Mr. Solorzano commented that the hours for transporting/handling and digging and erecting submitted by ATT appeared high. Ms. Thomas agreed, and stated that she would research the costs upon returning to her office.

Ms. Haney stated that she decided to go with Verizon's individual pole costs. Therefore, Verizon costs are to be removed from the weighted-average costs. The changes are noted, and the members will review the revised weighted-average costs at the next meeting.

The members then reviewed costs submitted by those members opting to publish their costs individually. Mr. Solorzano suggested approving those individual costs, if the members agree at the next Board meeting. The pole costs would not become effective until January 01, 2005. The City of Pasadena submitted only four pole costs. The question of how to handle a JPA from Pasadena that included a pole height that was not included in their submitted costs. Ms. Corella responded that in a previous situation, the JPC office called Pasadena, and they were given a cost for the JPA. The members corrected Ms. Corella and stated that Pasadena should have defaulted to the weighted-average cost. It was agreed to include the statement that costs not included for a pole height on a JPA for a member, who has opted to use individual costs, than the cost would default to the weighted-average cost. The costs that were agreed upon were the individual wood pole costs for City of Anaheim, City of Los Angeles, City of Pasadena and Edison. The attending members accepted composite fiberglass submitted by Edison. However, all other members setting the aforementioned poles should do so via special agreement, section 1.2. The members questioned the substantial increase in the cost of Edison lightweight steel poles. Mr. Solorzano responded that the contributing factors to the cost increase are that 1) Edison is now purchasing a better class of steel poles than in prior years, 2) the increase in the cost of steel, and 3) the increase in the cost of freight. Therefore, Mr. Solorzano stated that he would research this further upon his return to his organization. Also noted was that the composite fiberglass costs decreased. Mr. Solorzano responded that Edison is now purchasing this type pole in greater volume, therefore, the supplier is requiring a lower cost per pole. It was agreed that not until the entire costs submitted by members no longer required discussion, and were accepted by the Board, would said costs be considered for motion and approval.

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1280: Authorized Signatures – RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1332: DWP Multi-Member Codes - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1341: Storm Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1343: Routine Revision – ROUTINE REVISION
- Item 1346: iPole Sharing with NCJPC - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1349: Review Initial Membership Fee - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1356: Review of By-Laws - RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1358: PG&E Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1360: Crane Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1361: Removal of Ivy - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1366: Review Anchor, Overhead and Down Guys - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1367: T-Mobile Membership Application- OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1369: Newpath Networks Membership Application - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1370: 2005 Pole Prices- AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1371: 2005 Salary Survey - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1372: 2005 Operating Budget - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1373: Form 9 Riser - ROUTINE REVISION

The members reviewed the unfinished business items. There were no questions, or concerns with these issues at this time.

Item 1339– *Environmental Issues*

This item remains open as an ongoing issue to ensure the Committee addresses any necessary environmental issues.

**New Business**

***Known Items:***

There were not known items.

***Unknown Items:***

Ms. Prouty reported that SBC is receiving finalized JPAs from Edison where the work has not been completed. She stated that she is not aware of any other members experiencing this problem, and she reported that SBC would halt the billing process. Mr. Solorzano questioned if Ms. Prouty had any examples. Ms. Prouty responded that she did not have any examples at this time, however, she would like Edison to be informed of the action to be taken by SBC. Ms. Prouty stated that her primary concern is that this is not an isolated issue, but there are many such JPAs being submitted to SBC. Ms. Haney stated that Verizon is also

experiencing a similar problem. Edison will work with SBC and Verizon, on resolving this issue.

*Authorized Costs Item 5.C – AT&T Wireless*

Ms. Corella reported that this issue was brought to the table by AT&T Wireless. The question is how should 5.C charges be distributed. This issue pertains to a multi-party JPA. AT&T Wireless is of the opinion since the topping of the pole is to accommodate the telco, then the cost should be split between power and communications. Mr. Solorzano stated that several years ago, the Committee agreed that this cost should be distributed equally among all joint members, since it benefits all members. Mr. Brown suggested to table this discussion until the incoming month when, and if, AT&T Wireless is available to attend.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Authorized Costs	11/10/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office(tentative)
Routine Revision	11/10/04	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	11/17/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	11/17/04	Following	Administrative Board
Reorganization	11/17/04	Following	Operating Committee
IPole Committee	TO	BE	ANNOUNCED

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Mr. Brown adjourned the meeting at 10:45 a.m., until November 17, 2004.

---

Ms. Kathleen Dell, President

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

**Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3  
San Dimas, CA 91773  
Phone (909) 592-4001  
Fax (909) 592-4636

November 17, 2004

A regular meeting of the **Administrative Board** took place on the above date, at 9:00 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Ms. Kathleen Dell	AT&T Wireless
Mr. Charles Vranek	Cingular Wireless
Mr. Robert Allen	City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena
Mr. Randall Starkey	Adelphia Cable Communications
Mr. Ernie Solorzano	Southern California Edison
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS
Ms. Velma Prouty	SBC – Pacific Bell
Ms. Paula Haney	Verizon California
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

**CALL TO ORDER:**

President, Ms. Dell called the meeting to order at 9:15 am.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Ms. Dell asked the members to review the minutes of the October 20, 2004 Board meeting. After the members reviewed the minutes, Ms. Dell inquired if there were any corrections, additions or deletions to the minutes. Mr. Brown stated that there was a typo on page four, the last paragraph, second line. *Board* was misspelled as *Broad*. Ms. Corella noted the typo. There were no further corrections, additions, or deletions. Ms. Haney motioned to approve the October 20, 2004 minutes as corrected. Ms. Prouty seconded the motion, which upon voting, passed unanimously.

## **MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the gross operating expenses for October 2004 totaled \$55,347.07. The members were assessed this amount. October is reflecting an above average month, due to an additional payroll period.

## **COMMUNICATIONS:**

### ***Mpower Communications***

Ms. Corella reported that she received communications from Mpower Communications in reference to ICG Communications (see attachment). In a synopsis, the letter states that Mpower Communications would be obtaining the California business of ICG Communications. Ms. Corella read the communication verbatim to the attending members. The letter states that all contacts are to remain the same until further notice. Ms. Corella reported that she would report any and all further communications she receives in regards to this acquisition.

Mr. Solorzano stated that it appears that mergers and acquisitions among utilities are happening in greater frequency. He is of the opinion that perhaps the members should review the Agreement to address the issue of outstanding, unfinished JPAs and resolution prior to Committee approval of acquisitions. What is prompting Mr. Solorzano's concern is the current issue with the purchase by Champion Broadband of Altrio's assets. Mr. Allen questioned if in situations of mergers and acquisitions, does the acquiring entity automatically obtain SCJPC membership. Ms. Dell responded that it was determined by the Committee that the purchasing entity does in fact acquire membership. The members briefly reviewed the section in the Agreement that addresses mergers and acquisitions. Ms. Corella stated that there are specific criteria in the Agreement allowing and/or accepting membership assignment. It was agreed to discuss this issue extensively at the next Reorganization ad hoc meeting under **Item 1374: Review of 1998 Agreement**.

### ***Mr. Peter Sullivan – Argus Consultants***

Ms. Corella reported on a conversation between herself and Mr. Sullivan, the financial consultant for Altrio. She stated that Mr. Sullivan explained to her his relationship with Altrio, and how they advised Altrio financially. He reported that Altrio engaged Argus Consultants as financial consultants. After reviewing the Altrio financial situation, they discovered Altrio was insolvent. Altrio had a secured debt of \$12,000,000.00, and an unsecured debt of \$7,000,000.00. Argus proposed that Altrio liquidate their assets. Altrio assets were auctioned, and Champion Broadband purchased a large quantity of Altrio assets. She further reported that after auctioning all their assets, Altrio was not able to pay their entire credit debt. Mr. Sullivan stated that Altrio was no longer in existence.

Mr. Solorzano reported that his organization conducted an internal audit and field inspection to discover the pole attachment status with Altrio. Those JPAs where Edison revealed that Altrio did not construct were cancelled. The JPAs that revealed construction or had a lead remained active. Mr. Solorzano intends on arranging a meeting with Champion Broadband to discuss if they plan on executing a lease agreement with Edison, and if they do not, they must remove their facilities. Mr. Solorzano suggested on JPAs that have been finalized, but joint members have not been reimbursed, should be reversed and handled as tenants. The member who sold Altrio their space on the pole would generate the lease agreement. Mr. Cox stated that he did not have the resources to field check and verify which member sold Altrio the respective space on the pole. This task would prove labor intensive, and cost ineffective.

Ms. Haney reported that she has observed that Champion is doing business under the Altrio name. She noticed it on a periodical publication (TV Guide). Mr. Cox stated that there are dispatched trucks displaying the Altrio name. Ms. Haney stated that Altrio claims that they do not exist yet they continue to advertise their logo.

Mr. Solorzano stated that he plans on meeting with the principals of Champion Broadband to discuss their plans in regards to pole attachment. Ms. Dell stated that hopefully, the meeting between Mr. Solorzano and the Champion principals would reveal information to aid all members in moving forward with the Altrio/Champion issue.

Ms. Corella then reported that she queried Mr. Sullivan about the Committee membership, and how it was handled in the sale/auction of the Altrio assets. His response was that it is highly likely that it was ignored. Ms. Corella then stated that the monthly assessments are forwarded from Altrio to Argus Consultants in Boston. She left a message with Mr. Sullivan's office inquiring as to how he is handling the assessment invoices. She then stated that this issue would be discussed further in Operating.

Next, Ms. Corella reported that she received a telephone message from T-Mobile. The party stated that she has inquiry into the operation, and the relationship between the Committee and T-Mobile. Ms. Corella has not connected with the party at this time, but will report to the Committee when she does.

Ms. Corella read a message received from Dan Lewis in regards to iPole and the confirming of the specifications. The message states that there will be an iPole demonstration on December 8, 2004. The two participants will be Sprint and DWP. All other members are welcome to attend as observers.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

There were no special reports.

## **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

### **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements**

Chairman, Mr. Solorzano reported that Authorized Costs met in October 2004 (please refer to the minutes for any further details).

### **Operating Committee**

Chairman, Mr. Brown reported that the Operating Committee did meet in October 2004, (please refer to the minutes for further details).

### **ad hoc Committee on Reorganization**

Chairperson, Ms. Prouty reported that Reorganization met in October 2004, and would meet following the Board. The focus of Reorganization is to review the current By-Laws and propose any revisions if necessary.

### **Routine Revision Committee**

Chairperson, Ms. Prescott reported that Routine Revision did meet in October 2004. She reported that Sections 7 – 10 would be on the Discussion Calendar of the next Administrative Board meeting (Please refer to the minutes for further details).

### **IPole ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Solorzano reported on the involvement of Edison in this ad hoc committee. At a prior meeting, it had been decided that Mr. Dan Lewis would meet with Hyperlink to aid in resolving outstanding issues. After meeting with Hyperlink, it was discovered that there has been miscommunication between Hyperlink and the committee. He stated that in his opinion, the Committee has not been as committed to the iPole project as required. However, he does not want to appear critical and would like to thank those members who worked on this project in the past. He is aware due to the lack of time and resources, members have been unable to commit the time necessary to serve as project manager. Therefore, Mr. Solorzano stated that Edison would offer the time, experience and knowledge of Mr. Dan Lewis to act as project manager and point of contact between the Committee and Hyperlink on a going forward basis. In his opinion, the project manager should be someone who is available at all times. He reiterated that Edison is willing to

supply the resources to support this project. He stated that he would like to thank NextG for their effort toward this project; however, the project would be better served with a local point of contact who is available in a moments notice. After some discussion the members agreed with Mr. Solorzano's suggestion. Since it is year-end and it is time to nominate officers, it was agreed to assign a chairperson to the iPole ad hoc committee when the nomination committee meets later in the day.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

There were no items for consent.

**DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

***Item 1370: 2005 Pole Prices***

Ms. Dell announced that AT&T Wireless would have their pole prices published individually; therefore, not to be included in the weighted average. AT&T Wireless was removed from the spreadsheet. The members reviewed the revised weighted average prices. Mr. Solorzano motioned to accept and approve the proposed 2005 individual and weighted average pole prices effective January 1, 2005, with the caveat that those members who did not submit poles prices would default to the weighted average. Those members that submitted individual costs, and in the event that they set a pole, but neglected to submit the cost for that particular height, would also default to the weighted average. Ms. Thomas seconded the motion. The costs would be published on the SCJPC web site effective January 1, 2005.

It was confirmed that the 2005 Authorized Costs would increase by 2.5 percent. This action was approved in 2003 that the costs would increase in 2004 by 2.5 percent, and again in 2005 by 2.5 percent. This equates to a two-year 5 percent cost increase. The costs are to be published by January 1, 2005.

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1280: Authorized Signatures – RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1332: DWP Multi-Member Codes - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1341: Storm Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS
- Item 1343: Routine Revision – ROUTINE REVISION
- Item 1346: iPole Sharing with NCJPC - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1349: Review Initial Membership Fee - OPERATING COMMITTEE
- Item 1356: Review of By-Laws - RE-ORGANIZATION
- Item 1358: PG&E Reinstatement - OPERATING COMMITTEE

Item 1360: Crane Costs - AUTHORIZED COSTS  
Item 1361: Removal of Ivy - AUTHORIZED COSTS  
Item 1366: Review Anchor, Overhead and Down Guys - AUTHORIZED COSTS  
Item 1367: T-Mobile Membership Application- OPERATING COMMITTEE  
Item 1369: Newpath Networks Membership Application - OPERATING COMMITTEE  
Item 1370: 2005 Pole Prices- AUTHORIZED COSTS  
Item 1371: 2005 Salary Survey - OPERATING COMMITTEE  
Item 1372: 2005 Operating Budget - OPERATING COMMITTEE  
Item 1373: Form 9 Riser - ROUTINE REVISION  
Item 1374: Review of 1998 Agreement – REORGANIZATION

Mr. Solorzano stated that Edison is urging PG&E to either reinstatement their membership, or arrive at a lease agreement between themselves and Edison. According to Mr. Solorzano, they are illegally attached to Edison poles. He recommends to other members where PG&E are illegally attached to contact PG&E to address illegal attachments.

Item 1339– *Environmental Issues*

This item remains open as an ongoing issue to ensure the Committee addresses any necessary environmental issues.

## **New Business**

### ***Known Items:***

There were not known items.

### ***Unknown Items:***

#### *Authorized Costs Item 5.C – AT&T Wireless*

Ms. Corella reported that AT&T Wireless brought this issue to the table. She then presented a synopsis of what she believes to be the issue. The concern presented by Ms. Lupe Hernandez is the question of how AC item 5.C (topping) costs should be distributed among the members on the JPA. An example presented by Ms. Hernandez is on a 5-party JPA where the power company is topping a pole to accommodate a Telco company to PTD. Because it is a benefit to the Telco, she is of the opinion that the costs should be distributed between the power and Telco. She further stated that AT&T Wireless has previously received a prelim reflecting  $\frac{1}{2}(1)$ , and when the final is received it has been changed to  $\frac{1}{5}(1)$ . Ms. Hernandez is merely requesting clarification on the cost distribution; she is not disputing a decision. Ms. Corella stated that Mr. Solorzano stated at the previous Board

meeting that several years back at the Arcadia building, the members had agreed that this operation was mutually beneficial to all members on the pole; therefore, the costs should be distributed among all joint owners. Ms. Corella stated that after discussing this issue with the JPC senior staff, that 95% of JPAs reflect equally shared costs among all members on multi-party JPAs. The members discussed that the JPC staff does not have the latitude to change finalized JPAs received in the office. The consensus is that any JPAs received at the JPC office should be returned, and that a phone call is not necessary. The JPC has been instructed to maintain a return error log for 90 days to track the errors of members and their staff. The 90-day error report is to be presented at the March Operating committee.

The final consensus on the original issue is that AC 5.C is a cost shared among all members on the JPA. If the JPC office receives a final multi-party JPA that reflects 1/2(1), this JPA should be returned because it is incorrect.

Ms. Dell then solicited volunteers for the nominating committee. Mr. Solorzano, Ms. Haney, Mr. Brown, Mr. Starkey, Mr. Allen and Ms. Prouty volunteered for the ad hoc committee.

The members decided that a December Board meeting was not necessary.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Authorized Costs	To	Be	Announced
Routine Revision	To	Be	Announced
IPole Committee	12/08/04	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Administrative Board	01/19/05	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	01/19/05	Following	Administrative Board
Reorganization	01/19/05	Following	Operating Committee

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Mr. Brown adjourned the meeting at 11:45 a.m., until January 19, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Kathleen Dell, President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jennie Corella, Office Manager

2 copies



October 22, 2004

Southern California Joint Ownership  
437 South Cataract Ave., Suite 3  
San Dimas, CA 91773

Valued Partner:

We are very pleased to tell you about Mpower Communication's announcement to acquire ICG Communications' California business. We are working towards a quick and smooth transition, and we see this as a great opportunity for both Mpower, as well as the vendors and partners that currently provide service to Mpower and ICG.

This transaction is subject to regulatory approval, which we expect to receive within the next 45 to 60 days. However, Mpower assumed immediate management control of ICG California's customer base and network assets.

Over the next few months, please note the following:

- **There will be no change in your day-to-day operations.**
- **You should continue to deal with your established points of contact.**

Mpower is a financially solid competitive local exchange company with no long-term debt, a seasoned management team, and is publicly traded (AMEX:MPE) with fully audited financial statements. Mpower Communications is a wholly owned subsidiary of Mpower Holding Corporation. More information about Mpower Communications and the details of today's announcement with ICG Communications can be found at <http://mpowercom.com/icg>.

As we make this transition, we wish to thank you for your support and look forward to a continued relationship.

Sincerely,

Rolla P. Huff  
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer  
Mpower Communications

Dan Caruso  
President and CEO  
ICG Communications