

**Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

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

April 15, 2009

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. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Mr. Cory Autrey	Sprint-Nextel/Sprint Communications
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Mr. Rich Rolita	CA Clec LLC (teleconference)
Ms. Charito De Castro	City of Glendale
Mr. Mahendra Garg	City of Anaheim
Mr. Dan Kjar	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Daniel Lippert	City of Burbank
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles(teleconference)
Ms. Patti Ringo	ExteNet Systems (teleconference)
Mr. Doug Schmaderer	City of Pasadena (teleconference)
Ms. Maryam Farajzadeh	City of Vernon
Mr. Justin Cashmer	Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Steve Rodriguez	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Michael Glassey	AT&T Communications/Local Serv.
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Roger Ohms	City of Banning
Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Committee president Ms. Goetz called the meeting to order at 9:10 am. After accounting for all attendees, and teleconferencing members, Ms. Goetz addressed the first agenda item.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Ms. Goetz asked the members to review the March 18, 2009 Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. There were no revisions to the minutes. Mr. Autrey motioned to accept the minutes as written; Mr. Rodriguez seconded the motion, which upon voting passed unanimously.

## **MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the March 2009 budget expenses are \$42,978.68. She added that the month of March reflects an average month. The members were fully assessed this amount.

## **COMMUNICATIONS:**

Ms. Corella reported that an outside entity interested in committee membership has requested the ability to view the SCJPC 1998 Agreement, prior to officially applying for membership. She added that an applicant for membership has requested to view the Routine Handbook prior to moving forward with their membership application and signing the Agreement. These questions were brought to the Board for discussion. The consensus was to contact the committee legal and question if it is prudent to allow outside entities to view the aforementioned documents prior to applying for and/or becoming members. Ms. Corella then read the letter she drafted and mailed to Mr. Roger Adams, the committee legal. She added that she expects to receive his response prior to the next board meeting.

Ms. Corella then reported that the Computer communications ad hoc committee has decided to invite Hyperlink Technology to present a demonstration of the iPAM software. This would enable members to familiarize themselves with the application and/or refresh their memories, and determine the extent of benefit the software would deliver. This would also allow newer member representatives the opportunity to view the software. She further stated that originally the plan was for the demonstration to transpire at the current meeting, however, Mr. Atalla responded that he would require more time to update the database and software, but would plan on presenting the demonstration at the May board meeting. Ms. Corella highly recommends that members plan on attending, or teleconferencing the next board meeting to view the demonstration.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

*There were no special reports.*

## **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

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

Mr. Walls reported that the ad hoc met on April 15, 2009. The primary topic of discussion was the reviewing of the authorized costs items and titles to determine if they are currently applicable and/or if any require revision. He added that the ad hoc committee would be reviewing all costs, and if any members have a question or issue regarding any costs, to plan on attending the next meeting.

### **Operating Committee**

Mr. Autrey reported that the operating committee met on March 18, 2009. He reported that the ad hoc reviewed the standing monthly agenda items. He added that the members scrutinized the operating budget items in preparation for next year's budget, and any method of reducing the budget for the incoming 2010 year. The consensus is that the budget items are sufficient as they stand at this point in time. The next concern with the operating budget is which items should be proportionately or equally assessed in relation to volume of work versus equal benefit to the entire membership. The ad hoc would continue to address this concern.

Another major concern for the ad hoc operating committee is the office lease expiration this October. Currently, the ad hoc is reviewing comparable offices, and would continue to do so in determining whether to relocate, or remain in the current office.

Other issues discussed were the JPC office emergency handbook, and the implementation of a T1 connection. These issues are on the current agenda under unknown items.

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

Mr. Wolfe reported that the ad hoc met on April 15, 2009. He reported that the ad hoc discussed compliance with the Routine Handbook, and the reconfiguration of AT&T California to address any backlog issues. The ad hoc reviewed section 11 of the Agreement. The consensus is that the ad hoc members submit a copy of the Agreement to their respective legal departments for review and comments.

### **Routine Revision Committee**

Ms. Hernandez reported that the ad hoc met on April 15, 2009. She reported that Section 5.1-C has been updated. She further reported that the ad hoc would be starting extensive discussion on the topic of wind loading. She recommends that all members participate in the meeting, since this is a topic affecting all members.

She added that the ad hoc has discussed a time frame for final billing. She added that the Handbook states that the final can be billed no less than the 45 days from the issue of the Form 48, or if all approved, can be billed prior to the 45 days. But what is lacking is that the final bill must be issued no later than XX days. She added that it was agreed that the final billing would be no less than 45 days, and no greater than 90 days from Form 48 issue date. This revision is on the JPA Alert, and would become effective January 2010.

She reported that the ad hoc discussed the issue of rearrangement. When an incoming member attaches their facilities and rearranges the space, and the result is additional space, the consensus is that the incoming member would purchase the additional space. This revision is on the JPA Alert, and would become effective January 2010, and on this agenda under unknown items to be announced to the committee. Ms. Hernandez encouraged the members to read the minutes when they are published on the web site, and to attend the next Routine Revision ad hoc meeting.

### **Computer Communications ad hoc Committee**

Ms. Goetz reported that the ad hoc committee met on April 15, 2009. The ad hoc has added a new item entitled, "Pole class field on Pole Record". Ms. Pranata is to contact Hyperlink Technology to determine the ability and cost to place a field on the pole card record for pole class, GPS information, and replacement pole number. She added that Hyperlink would be presenting an iPAM demonstration at the next board meeting.

### **Basic JPA Orientation and Training ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Lippert reported that the ad hoc met on April 15, 2009. He added that the latest draft of the training module is available on the web site. The section addressing the Form 2 is nearly completed. He stated that the ad hoc is soliciting completed copies of Form 48's and Form 7's to be used in the training module. Mr. Lippert inquired if any members have the aforementioned forms that they would like to see in the training manual, to please submit a copy to him, Ms. Pranata or Ms. Corella.

### **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

*No items for consent*

**DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

*No items for consent*

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS 03/14/07)
- Item 1436: Compliance with Routine - ROUTINE REVISION (03/21/07)
- Item 1440: Review of 1998 Agreement - RE-ORGANIZATION (05/18/07)
- Item 1446: Rev. of Sect. 4.0/4.1 & Rev.of Hdbk-ROUTINE REVISION (08/15/07)
- Item 1458: Basic JPA Overview Training - OPERATING COMMITTEE (02/20/08)
- Item 1462: Sect 7.12 OT Cost/Disaster Replmt - ROUTINE REVISION (04/08/08)
- Item 1471: Draft Final Process - ROUTINE REVISION (09/09/08)
- Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement - ROUTINE REVISION (09/17/08)
- Item 1475: 2010 Operating Budget - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1476: Lease Expiration - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1481: American Tower Mbrship App. - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1482: Non-Disclosure for Handbook - OPERATING COMMITTEE (1/21/09)
- Item 1483: Section 16.1-B Elimination - ROUTINE REVISION (01/21/09)
- Item 1485: Final Initiation Requirements - ROUTINE REVISION (01/21/09)
- Item 1486: Offsite Server BackUp/T1 Fees- OPERATING COMMITTEE (3/18/09)

The members reviewed the items, and all items remain open for further discussion within the ad hoc committees.

**Item 1485: *Environmental Issues***

This is a standing open item.

**New Business**

***Known Items:***

*No new known items.*

**Unknown Items:**

Item 1486: Off Site Server Back-up Operating Expense

Ms. Corella reported that it has been highly recommended by the Operating committee that the SCJPC server, in its entirety, should be backed up off-site for security purposes in the event of an emergency office disaster. She further reported that Ms. Pranata procured quotes for this type service. The best option is a company called Velocity Network Solutions. Ms. Pranata displayed the breakdown of monthly costs. The total cost for a 36-month period, including the one time installation fee is \$11,959.00. She added this would add to the monthly operating expenses \$299.00 to be equally assessed to the members.

Mr. Autrey stated that the monthly expense is within the authority of the operating committee, however, since the committee would be signing a three-year contract, they feel it necessary to inform all members of this new monthly expense. The concept of an offsite entity retaining and backing up the SCJPC server is not only highly recommended, but necessary.

Mr. Rodriguez inquired if other networking companies were considered. Ms. Pranata responded that she presented several quotes to the operating committee, and the consensus is that Velocity Network Solutions is the best option.

Mr. Rodriguez inquired if the scanned disks of JPC historical documents would be backed up onto the offsite server. Ms. Pranata responded that the service does not include backing up scanned CD's. Ms. Prescott stated that the backing up of CD's onto an offsite service would be a one-time backup.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that in his opinion, 100GB does not appear to be large enough for all the data that should be backed up, which should include archiving the scanned documents.

Mr. Autrey stated that increasing the size to 200GB would increase the cost to \$599.00 per month.

It was agreed that since the longevity of CD's is limited, the documents currently scanned on CD's should be backed up to an off-site server.

Ms. Prescott stated that since the CD's are to be archived, and not backed up, the service could store these files off-site. The cost would be for storage, and not a periodic back up.

The final consensus is to have Ms. Pranata inquire into the additional cost of storing archived data on an off-site server, and present the additional costs to the operating committee.

Item 1488: Pole Class Field on Pole Record

Mr. Wolfe stated that he suggested recording the pole class on the JPC pole records. This would require notating the pole class on the JPA. The current application used at the JPC office would require an enhancement for an additional field to enter the pole class information. Where to place the pole class information

on the JPA would need to be determined. Ms. Goetz stated that at the ad hoc meeting it was suggested that in the interim to place the pole class in the pole treat column.

This item is assigned to the Routine Revision ad hoc committee and would be discussed further at the next meeting.

*Item 1489: Assignment of Space Resulting from Rearrangement*

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion by stating that the Routine ad hoc committee has agreed that the incoming member would purchase the additional space resulting from rearrangement. She added that the logic is that the incoming member is the cost causer of the rearrangement; then it is incumbent on the incoming member to reimburse all joint members for any space they would lose, since all other members were content with the original configuration on the pole. Ms. Hernandez inquired if any members had any concerns or issues with this agreement.

Mr. Wolfe stated that he does not have a problem, but for clarification, the incoming member would pay for the additional space, and the space would go under the ownership of the power company.

Ms. Hernandez stated that this is not her understanding. She added that if the power company is the member to gain the additional space, then they must purchase it, not the incoming party. She further added that originally, the additional space was given to the base owner, but the decision is that the incoming member should purchase any additional space since their action is the cost causer.

After discussion, Ms. Hernandez stated that she was of the opinion that the ad hoc had agreed that the incoming party would purchase any additional space. However, she added that it appears this item requires further discussion. This item is returned to the ad hoc Routine Revision committee for further discussion.

Ms. Haney stated that the ad hoc had agreed that the incoming member purchases the additional space. She added that NG experiences this scenario on many occasions. She further stated that in most instances the additional space is adjacent to the space they are purchasing. Therefore, to the ad hoc committee this solution appears the best one in this type scenario.

Ms. Prescott remarked that the space should not be given, but should be purchased, since someone initially paid for the additional space, being the base owner or a joint member. Therefore, she is of the opinion that the incoming member should purchase the space, or if the base owner desires the space should be given option to purchase. She added that space should not be given arbitrarily.

Mr. Wolfe responded that he does not view his option as giving space away, but as redistributing the structural value of the pole. The cost should be bore by the incoming member.

Ms. Hernandez reiterated that this discussion should be taken back to the ad hoc. Again, she encouraged all those who partook in this discussion to attend the Routine Revision ad hoc meeting. She added that the ad hoc members arrive at a consensus, but when presented to the board, members push back. If this discussion had transpired at the ad hoc level, perhaps it would expedite a

resolution. She closed the discussion by highly encouraging members to attend or teleconference the next Routine Revision ad hoc meeting.

*Staff Compensation when Office rendered inoperable*

Ms. Corella opened discussion by briefing the members on this item. She stated that the operating committee is soliciting data on how each member addresses staff compensation in the event of a disaster rendering the office inoperable. This is the last issue of concern in completion of the SCJPC Emergency Handbook. Ms. Corella reported that in researching this, she discovered there is no legal mandate that employers must compensate employees should the work place become inoperable, and if necessary employees could draw on unemployment benefits.

Mr. Wolfe stated that it is difficult to compare larger corporation policies to those of such a small office as the JPC.

Mr. Garg stated that he has submitted Anaheim's policy in addressing this issue, but the City of Anaheim is a large municipality.

Mr. Autrey stated that Ms. Corella did confirm that there is no legal obligation for compensation; however, the question remains if the members feel it necessary to do so.

Ms. Corella stated that in her opinion the committee should determine the amount of time the staff should be compensated while another location, or the current location becomes available for operation. She added it could be one day to several. She further added that Mr. Wolfe suggested paying the staff the remainder of the current pay-period. This could also depend on the degree of damage, and recovery time.

Mr. Rolita stated that this issue would depend on the length of time to reassemble the office and bring the staff together, or set up staff to work from home. He added that the next step is to set up a contingency plan in the case of emergencies, and examine the time interval to set up operations, and determine the length of compensation.

Ms. Prescott stated that the staff would be working. They would be in the process of recovery data, and getting the internal network up and running. She added that it would not be the usual type of work performed, but it would still be a type of work.

The consensus is to continue discussing this issue at the operating ad hoc committee level.

*To Teleconferencing member: Is quality of audio portion of WebEx acceptable?*

Mr. Wolfe stated that he has no problem with the audio. The other members responded there is no problem.

Ms. Corella inquired of the attending members, if they are content with the new conference room configuration, or would prefer the old set-up. The consensus is to return the room to the previous configuration.

Photographs of representatives on web page.

Mr. Garg proposed uploading a photo of each representative on the SCJPC web site. He added that this would aid members in recognition. He further stated that this is a practice within the City of Anaheim. After discussion it was agreed to discuss this at operating committee level.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Basic JPA Tr/Orientation	05/07/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Routine Revision	05/12/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Computer Committee	05/12/09	Following	Routine Revision
Authorized Costs	05/12/09	Following	Computer Committee
Reorganization	05/12/09	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	05/20/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	05/20/09	Following.	Administrative Board

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Goetz adjourned the meeting at 10.45 a.m., until May 20, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Sherri Goetz, President.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operation

## Southern California Joint Pole Committee

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

August 19, 2009

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. Paula Haney	NextG Networks (teleconference)
Mr. Cory Autrey	Sprint-Nextel/Sprint Communications
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena (teleconference)
Ms. Kourtney Aboudara	NextG Networks (teleconference)
Ms. Maryam Farajzadeh	City of Vernon (teleconference)
Mr. Varghese George	City of Glendale
Ms. Annetta Baker	City of Colton (teleconference)
Mr. Dan Kjar	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles (teleconference)
Mr. Rudy Villavicencio	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Mr. Mahendra Garg	City of Anaheim
Ms. Patti Ringo	ExTeNet Systems (teleconference)
Mr. Randall Starkey	Time-Warner (teleconference)
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc (teleconference)
Mr. Mark Denning	M-Power/Telepacific (teleconference)
Ms. Bridget Courtney	Golden State Water (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Justin Cashmer	Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Don Beckermann	MCI Comm/MCI Metro (teleconference)
Mr. Steve Rodriguez	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Michael Glassey	AT&T Comm/Local Serv.
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Mobility
Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Bill Murphy	So. California Edison (teleconference)
Mr. Daniel Lippert	City of Burbank
Mr. Chuck Thurman	City of Banning (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

Guests: Ms. Maryam Adhami County of Los Angeles  
Mr. Dennis Ruh County of Los Angeles  
Ms. Jackie Aguilar Southern California Edison

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Committee president Ms. Goetz called the meeting to order at 9:10 am and allowed for introductions from those members in attendance and teleconferencing. The roll was taken and verified to ensure that all attendance is recorded correctly.

**HOUSEKEEPING:**

Ms. Goetz requested that those members who intend on remaining for lunch, complete their menu sheets, and submit them to Ms. Corella when completed.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Ms. Goetz asked the members to review the July 15, 2009 Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. Mr. Rodriguez reported that Mr. Rolita's name is misspelled on page 6. The typo was noted. Ms. Hernandez motioned to accept the minutes as corrected; Mr. Autrey seconded the motion. After the votes were tallied, the motion passed unanimously.

**MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the July 2009 budget expenses are \$61,035.64. She added that the month of July is reflecting an above average month. The anomaly is due to July having a 3-payroll period as opposed to the normal 2-payroll period months. The members were fully assessed this amount.

**COMMUNICATIONS:**

*Lorraine Abbott*

Ms. Corella reported Ms. Lorraine Abbott, a former SCJPC employee, who received a nominal monthly pension from the committee, is now deceased. Ms. Abbott was the last employee who was a part of the retirement special agreement.

### *Above Ground Facilities – LA Public Works*

Ms. Corella reported that she received an email communication from Mr. Michael Kantor-Deputy City Engineer of the LA Public Works (see attachment). She added that the communication is in reference to above ground facilities –AGF’s. She then proceeded to read the communication, and the later dialogue to the members. In the correspondence, Mr. Kantor is requesting a copy of GO 95. Ms. Corella was informed that this information is available via the web.

Mr. Walls stated that he provided the number of the JPC office, and the Agreement.

The consensus among the members is to send the communication document out to the members in the event that the communication might have an impact on their organization.

### **SPECIAL REPORTS**

#### *County of Los Angeles Permitting Requirements – Ms. Maryam Adhami*

Mr. Gonzales opened by briefing the attendees on the purpose and objectives of the special report. He stated that during a meeting that transpired between SCE, and the invited guests, SCE invited the guests to attend a Board meeting to address their concerns in regards to LA county permits, and answer any questions posed by the Board members. Introductions then followed.

Ms. Adhami opened the dialogue by reporting that a major problem for the county of Los Angeles is pole replacements. She stated that she is aware that when SCE replaces a pole at a specific site, it is the responsibility of other joint member(s) to visit the site, transfer their facilities, and the last member agrees to pull the old pole and dispose of it. She added that she is aware that the process might require one year’s time, and in some instances the second pole is never pulled. She added that the county is losing control in allowing SCE to obtain their permits online, and assuming the joint members would do their share of the process. She further added that the county is expensing unnecessary resources in tracking the poles, and it has come to light that the county is losing revenue from this tracking process. This is no longer acceptable. SCE is no longer allowed to apply for permits online; they now must apply at each office for setting the new pole and removing their facilities. However, the county has been holding SCE responsible for coordinating the replacement process among all member utilities. She added that this has not been successful in that SCE does not feel the coordination is their responsibility. There have been meetings between SCE and the county to arrive at a solution. She stated that there is a proposed process that would make joint owners responsible as well as SCE. She further added that she would like to obtain a better understanding of the committee’s roles and responsibilities in regards to pole replacements. Also, a method where the committee process works well for the members, and the county does not experience further loss of revenues, or SCE bearing the entire cost. Ms.

Admami shared photographs of situations in the field where the old pole remains attached to the newly set pole.

Mr. Garg stated that the City of Anaheim experiences a similar problem. He further added that municipalities are losing revenue dealing with this dilemma. Mr. George added that the City of Glendale is also experiencing problems and loss of revenue with second poles attached next to new pole sets, and not being removed in a timely manner.

Mr. Ruh stated that in some situations, the second pole has been left in the field so long that it is difficult to differentiate between the newly set pole and the old pole. He added that the proposal for SCE is that the County would no longer allow permits until all members on the pole have their permits in place. He further added that the other members are not obtaining permits to transfer their facilities.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that in speaking for T-Mobile, they obtain an annual maintenance permit within county right-of-ways.

Ms. Adhami stated that this process is not within the bounds of maintenance. She added maintenance in most instances requires closing a street lane. Mr. Rodriguez responded that T-Mobile acquires street closure permits. Ms. Adhami stated that 90 percent of maintenance requires street closure.

Ms. Aguilar stated that the primary concern is the acquiring of permits, and added that it does not necessarily have to be SCE that acquires the permit, any member on the pole is able to initiate the permit request. She added that the objective is to gain a better process of knowing when the other utility plans on removing and disposing of the old pole.

Mr. Ruh added that the county is not being notified when work is performed in the public right of way; therefore, they do not have the opportunity to inspect the site to ensure that it is correct and safe even though the County is responsible for the safety of their constituents. Therefore, they are proposing not to issue pole permits to SCE until all other joint members on the pole have obtained their permits to remove their facilities.

Mr. Cashmer stated that if all members obtain their permits simultaneously, and SCE takes more than 45 days to complete their work, the other member permits have expired.

Ms. Adhami responded that the permit term is sixty days to complete the work. The time issue requires resolution among member utilities.

Mr. Lippert remarked that the telecomm members are forced to acquire permits months in advance of starting their work since they are dependent on SCE completely their work first.

Ms. Adhami responded that they work with utilities by allowing a one-time extension of their permit. She added that the county would desire the knowledge of what utilities are on the pole in advance of issuing permits.

Mr. Ruh stated that the county receives complaints about half-poles left attached to poles in the field, and shared a photo of such pole.

Ms. Adhami stated that she has to dispatch inspectors to investigate poles to ensure that they are publicly safe and have been permitted. Again, she reiterated that someone must bear the cost of these inspections. The county cannot afford the expense and must recoup this expense from the utilities.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that a communication company couldn't be held responsible if they are not notified by SCE.

Mr. Gonzales responded that the JPA process, if followed is a method of notifying other joint owners on a pole. He further stated that there is a current process in place that addresses the notification concern and that is the JPA process if followed correctly.

Mr. Rodriguez responded that he was speaking of notification of the permit acquisition.

Mr. Gonzales responded that they pull their permits when they meet with the county and are ready to commence the fieldwork. He added that the purpose of inviting the county to the table is so they might express their concerns and their suggestions for resolution.

Mr. Wolfe stated that AT&T California is willing to work with the County of Los Angeles in regards to permits and expediting the process of pole replacement/removal. He informed the county that AT&T California has implemented a new process to address the backlog of work in regards to pulling, transporting and depositing of poles. He stated that 90% of pole removal is the responsibility of the lowest owner on the pole, and that is communications.

Ms. Adhami then questioned if the party responsible for removing the pole is identified early in the process?

Mr. Wolfe responded that not always, but in a great percentage of situations the statement is correct. All pole owners have a responsibility to transfer their facilities in the specified time frame, and members are not responsible for other member's actions.

Mr. Ruh stated that a reason for not issuing permits to SCE is that no one is monitoring the joint pole member(s) attached if and when their facilities have been removed, and the pole disposed. The county is incurring the expense of inspecting the poles to ensure that facilities are removed and the pole is disposed. There are instances where poles have sat for ten years that should have been removed from the field. It appears that the SCJPC is doing a poor job in insuring that poles are removed from the field. Therefore, it appears that the county must take action toward resolution.

Mr. Ruh questioned why the members don't engage one contractor to do the entire pole project from start to finish.

Ms. Hernandez responded that this issue of one entity handling the entire project has been discussed within the SCJPC for many years. An ad hoc committee had been formed (Single Trip to Pole); however, the primary issue is unions. The electrical union and the communications union held that if a contractor is utilized to handle the project, then work is taken from either the electrical union or the communications union. She added that the ad hoc never arrived at a resolution.

Ms. Adhami reiterated that permit requests for pole replacement by SCE must be accompanied by a list of all joint owners on the pole.

Ms. Prescott stated that many members do a single trip to the pole and transfer all necessary facilities. Those members include T-Mobile, AT&T Mobility, and Sprint. She added that there are situations with three to four owners where one contractor is dispatched to transfer all facilities. She inquired if the county is

expecting all members to obtain a permit, when one contractor is utilized to handle the entire pole project. Would one permit suffice, since only one contractor will visit the site only one time?

Mr. Ruh responded to list all members, and the work performed on behalf of each member on one permit.

Mr. Autrey inquired if the initial SCE permit request lists all joint owners, does this require only one permit?

Mr. Ruh responded that all owners on the list must request an individual permit.

Ms. Aguilar responded that SCE is unable to monitor other members. She added that SCE has proposed to the county that the joint members that are listed on the JPA would be included on their permit request. SCE cannot have their permits delayed, in that SCE is mandated by the CPUC, especially in reference to pole replacements. The other members are to provide the county with a single point of contact.

Mr. Ruh responded that this method is placing the responsibility of monitoring on the county.

Ms. Adhami stated that prior to visiting the SCJPC office, her impression of the committee is that it acts as a policing organization, and could pressure members to comply with the timelines in removing poles. She understands now that the committee is a method of documenting transactions amongst members.

Mr. Wolfe responded that the JPC office does in fact maintain the records, but the committee members do have the ability to discuss issues of non-compliance and attempt resolution.

Ms. Prescott added that the committee does not police one another, but do have the avenues via ad hoc meetings to apply some pressure on those members not complying with committee agreements.

Ms. Adhami responded that the only method of monitoring control within her organization is by holding all members responsible at the time of initiation. She added that the county gets many calls daily about SCE contractors working in the field and/or closing traffic lanes without permits to perform the work. She further added that the county could no longer incur the expense of monitoring this work. SCE is now to identify members on poles when they apply for permits, and those members identified must also apply for permits to perform their work at the same time.

The current problem today is that the county bills SCE and SCE no longer desire to solely incur this expense.

Ms. Adhami stated that from the last meeting with SCE, they informed SCE that they would accept their requests for permits with the other member names on the request, providing they provide a list of the other joint members on the pole. The process will remain in place until the next meeting. At the next meeting the county would arrive at a decision. Either the SCJPC is to create a process to ensure that all work is completed without the need of the county's intervention or the county would no longer issue permits to SCE unless all members apply for a permit. Ms. Adhami added that the pressure is now on the members to comply.

Mr. Gonzales responded that there is greater pressure on SCE, and that SCE should not be hold responsible for other member's process and actions.

SCE has agreed to provide a list of other members along with their permit requests. Ms. Aguilar stated that she would provide the names of the members, but could not provide the contact numbers.

Ms. Adhami stated that she would require a contact number for members on the list.

Mr. Gonzales stated that SCE has no control over who the contact parties are within other organizations and their work schedules.

Ms. Aguilar stated the joint members would provide their respective contact name and numbers. She added that on the JPA Form 2 all other joint members are listed.

Mr. Wolfe stated that he would work with LA County on behalf of AT&T California. He is aware that AT&T California is a large percentage of the pole backlog. He added that his organization would plan to meet with LA County to work and collaborate on a resolution to this concern.

Ms. Adhami stated another issue with the county is the calls they receive from their constituents that there is a lane closure, and when a county inspector is dispatched to the scene, it is revealed that the utility is not permitted to close the lane to work on the pole. She added that the county is not attempting to generate revenue, but to lower costs and expenses in monitoring the right of way.

Ms. Adhami responded that LA County is here to work with the members toward a solution (see attachment II for business card information). She added that she would gladly meet with AT&T California. The objective is to work together and arrive at a resolution to the monitoring of the status of poles

The consensus is that the LA County is to return in two months and attend the October 2009 Board meeting to determine if the SCE improved process is successful in resolving the issue and concerns.

In closing, Ms. Adhami informed members that when replacing a pole, the replacement pole must meet county setback standards. This issue would be discussed further at a future meeting.

## **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

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

Ms. Goetz reported that the authorized costs ad hoc committee did not meet.

### **Operating Committee**

Mr. Autrey reported that the operating committee met on July 15, 2009. He reported that the members reviewed the standard agenda items. He stated that the

item of primary discussion is the lease expiration, and the decision of renewing the lease or relocating. He recommended members review the minutes of the meeting for further details.

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

Mr. Wolfe reported that the ad hoc committee on Reorganization did not meet.

### **Routine Revision Committee**

Ms. Hernandez reported that the ad hoc committee on Routine Revision did not meet.

### **Computer Communications ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Autrey reported that the ad hoc committee held an informal meeting. The participants would be receiving a link to download the iPAM application. He added that at the next ad hoc meeting, the members would discuss and document those actions items that would be tested.

### **Basic JPA Orientation and Training ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Lippert reported that the Basic JPA Orientation and Training ad hoc committee met on August 6, 2009. He further reported that the final draft of the training module is complete and available on the SCJPC.net website under the Members drop-down menu. He proposed that members review the presentation module and if there are any questions, or comments, to contact him, Ms. Pranata or Ms. Corella.

### **Pole Loading ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Wolfe reported that the ad hoc committee met on July 29<sup>th</sup>. He stated that the CPUC ruling is that members are to share pole-loading information. The ad hoc is to arrive at a process of accomplishing this, as well as other issues pertaining to pole loading. Mr. Dennis Walls has been elected as co-chair to the ad hoc committee. The next meeting is scheduled for August 26, 2009.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

There were no items for consent.

**DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

There were no items for discussion.

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS 03/14/07)
- Item 1440: Review of 1998 Agreement - RE-ORGANIZATION (05/18/07)
- Item 1446: Rev. of Sect. 4.0/4.1 & Rev.of Hdbk-ROUTINE REVISION (08/15/07)
- Item 1458: Basic JPA Overview Training – BASIC JPA TRAINING (02/20/08)
- Item 1462: Sect 7.12 OT Cost/Disaster Replmt - ROUTINE REVISION (04/08/08)
- Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement - ROUTINE REVISION (09/17/08)
- Item 1475: 2010 Operating Budget - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1476: Lease Expiration - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1481: American Tower Mbrship App. - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1482: Non-Disclosure for Handbook - OPERATING COMMITTEE (1/21/09)
- Item 1483: Section 16.1-B Revision - ROUTINE REVISION (01/21/09)
- Item 1487: Review of Auth Costs – AUTHORIZED COSTS (04/14/09)
- Item 1488: Pole Class Field on Pole Record - ROUTINE REVISION (04/14/09)
- Item 1489: Assign Space Result of Rearrangement-ROUTINE REVISION (04/14/09)
- Item 1490: Disaster Contingency Plan - OPERATING COMMITTEE (4/15/09)
- Item 1491: Form 49 Reformat - ROUTINE REVISION (05/20/09)
- Item 1492: 2010 Pole Prices - AUTHORIZED COSTS (06/09/09)
- Item 1493: Evaluate Pole Load Programs – POLE-LOADING (06/17/09)

Mr. Wolfe inquired as to the status of Item 1481: American Tower Corp. Ms. Corella responded that she neglected to report on the status. She reported that the financial documents have been submitted by the applicant, and have been forwarded to members for their review. She stated that she would send a reminder message to members.

Mr. Wolfe stated that the applicant has approached AT&T California for a blanket structure access to occupy space on H poles. He added that they have applied for membership with the NCJPA. He added that the NCJPA has reviewed their financials and they appear a strong corporation. Therefore, they are a solvent organization from the AT&T California perspective.

Mr. George inquired if Item 1493: Evaluate Pole Load Programs is in conjunction with the CPUC's pre-decision on pole loading. Mr. Wolfe responded

that it does somewhat, and that the decision would be discussed in the next pole loading ad hoc committee.

**Item 1485: *Environmental Issues***

This is a standing open item.

**New Business**

***Known Items:***

There were no known items.

***Unknown Items:***

**NCJPA Joint Pole Video**

Mr. Wolfe reported that PG&E has created a video in regards to pole setting. He has promised a copy to the SCJPC for their review.

**Member Representative Retirement**

Ms. Prescott announced that Mr. Malcolm Brown, representative for Verizon Wireless, would be retiring in the next month. Therefore, she proposed scheduling a retirement luncheon for Mr. Brown. This would be discussed further at the Operating ad hoc committee level.

**Cable Tag Photos**

Mr. Autrey proposed that members submit a photo of the cable tag they utilize to represent their utility organization. It has become difficult to identify cable owners. If members have changed tags and are now identified by a different tag, submit both tag pictures. This would provide additional aid to the field personnel. The photos could become available on the SCJPC.net web site. Ms. Corella would be sending out an email soliciting this information.

**Audio Interference**

Mr. Autrey stated that there is interference noise coming from teleconferencing members. Ms. Pranata stated that it is the member's headsets. It is proposed to announce during the housekeeping phase of the Board meetings that head set users should mute their audio.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Routine Revision	09/15/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Computer Committee	09/15/09	Following	Routine Revision
Authorized Costs	09/15/09	Following	Computer Committee
Reorganization	09/15/09	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	09/16/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	09/16/09	Following	Administrative Board
Pole Loading	08/26/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Goetz adjourned the meeting at 12:35 p.m., until September 16, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mr. Larry Chow, President.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operations

## Attachment I

Notice I received via Email July 28, 2009

Jennie,

In my duties as a Deputy City Engineer with the City of Los Angeles I have become involved with an issue related to installation of above ground facilities (AGFs) on joint poles. AGFs is a term used by the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works and we have an ordinance specifically related to the review, approval and installation of AGFs in the public right-of-way. Key statements related to the issue are summarized below:

1. Public Works has jurisdiction over the public property around utility poles, but doesn't control utility poles and cannot approve requests to mount equipment on poles at any height, low or high. Also noted is the "Non-Useable Footage" from your Southern California Joint Pole Agreement and the need for a more detailed definition of this space (i.e. is there a minimum height above the ground that facilities can be installed on a joint pole for safety clearance purposes).
2. Reference to General Order 95 and the issue of minimum clearance height from the ground. I do not have General Order 95 and a copy is requested.
3. Although the Department of Water and Power (DWP) is the City's JPA representative, the Department of Public Works permits activities within the public right-of-way. DWP is not involved with permit issuance for AGFs nor the issue of installation height of AGFs on joint poles.
4. Permanent foot braces (used for climbing poles) are installed no lower than 8-ft above grade and we wonder if this is indicative of a JPA standard or requirement for minimum height.
5. Is the JPA aware of AGF installations on facilities and in particular the installation of facilities lower than 8' above grade on these facilities?

The above statements relate to recent requests by communications companies to install AGFs on joint poles at heights we feel are too low for safety and clearance reasons. Any information you can provide would be of great assistance. You or your staff may also be contacted by Jeff LaDou of our department regarding this same issue.

Michael E. Kantor, P.E.  
Deputy City Engineer  
Bureau of Engineering  
Constituent Services and  
Permits Program  
(213) 485-4920

8-16-2009

Mr. Kantor's response to Manager

Jeannie,

Thank you for the update. In case you do not know, this issue is very relevant related to "low height" Verizon installations. I believe the Board of Public Works is scheduled to hear a report relative to low height Verizon installations and deny them. If the Board of Public Works acts consistent with the recommendation, the Board will deny these installations and allow the Bureau of Street Services to proceed to enforce LAMC Section 56.08(e) to effect removal of existing non-permitted Verizon fiber distribution hub cabinets already installed at low height on public utility poles in the public right-of-way.

I will look forward to any information you can provide.

Michael E. Kantor, P.E.  
Deputy City Engineer  
Bureau of Engineering  
Constituent Services and  
Permits Program  
(213) 485-4920

08-10-2009

Manager's Response to Mr. Kantor's original requests.

I cannot respond to your requests and questions at this time in that I act on behalf of the SCJPC members. I intend on taking your message and sharing it with the members at the next Administrative Board meeting on Wednesday, August 19th. They provide me with direction in acting as liaison for the Committee. I will contact you after next week's meeting.

Jennie Corella  
Manager of Operations  
Southern California Joint Pole Committee  
909-592-4001 ext. 12

**Attachment II**



County of Los Angeles  
Department of Public Works  
[www.dpw.lacounty.gov](http://www.dpw.lacounty.gov)

**DENNIS A. RUH**  
Supervisor, Contract Construction  
Construction Division

900 South Fremont Avenue, 8th Floor  
Alhambra, CA 91803-1331  
(626) 458-3136  
(626) 576-7739 FAX

Mailing Address:  
P.O. Box 1460  
Alhambra, CA 91802-1460



County of Los Angeles  
Department of Public Works  
[www.dpw.lacounty.gov](http://www.dpw.lacounty.gov)

**MARYAM ADHAMI, P.E.**  
Senior Civil Engineer  
Permits & Subdivisions  
Construction Division

900 South Fremont Avenue, 8th Floor  
Alhambra, CA 91803-1331  
(626) 458-4940  
(626) 576-7739 FAX  
(626) 979-5465 FAX

Mailing Address:  
P.O. Box 1460  
Alhambra, CA 91802-1460  
[madhami@dpw.lacounty.gov](mailto:madhami@dpw.lacounty.gov)



## 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, 2009

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. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Mr. Cory Autrey	Sprint-Nextel
Mr. Randall Starkey	Time Warner Cable (teleconference)
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Mr. Mark Denning	M-Power-Telepacific (teleconference)
Mr. Jenna Harrison	CA Clec LLC (teleconference)
Mr. Varghese George	City of Glendale
Mr. Mahendra Garg	City of Anaheim
Mr. Dan Kjar	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc (teleconference)
Mr. Daniel Lippert	City of Burbank
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles (teleconference)
Ms. Patti Ringo	ExteNet Systems (teleconference)
Mr. Gary Hironimus	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Mr. Justin Cashmer	Verizon California
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Steve Rodriguez	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Michael Glassey	AT&T Communications/Local Serv.
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Roger Ohms	City of Banning
Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Committee president Ms. Hernandez called the meeting to order at 9:10 am. When all teleconferencing members were accounted for, Ms. Hernandez allowed for introductions. She reminded all members to state their name prior to speaking.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Ms. Hernandez asked the members to review the November 20, 2008 Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. In that there were no corrections to the minutes, Ms. Hernandez requested a motion to accept the minutes as written. Mr. Rodriguez motioned to accept the minutes as written, and Ms. Haney seconded the motion, which upon voting, passed unanimously.

## **MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the December 2008 budget expenses are \$42,755.59. She added that the members were fully assessed this amount.

## **COMMUNICATIONS:**

Ms. Corella reported that she has received communication from American Tower Corporation, who has an interest in membership. She read the correspondence to the members. She added that she has responded to the applicant request with the response letter template and a copy of the 1998 SCJPC Agreement. She further added that the agreement states members agree to abide to the routine handbook, and the applicant is requesting the ability to review the handbook. Ms. Corella stated that historically, she has never received this type request.

Mr. Autrey stated that he is surprised that applicants have not made this type request in the past, because it is a valid request.

Ms. Haney stated that in her tenure with Verizon California, they would not allow documents out of the office, but would allow outsiders to visit the office and view documents.

Ms. Prescott stated that in her opinion, applicants would not really comprehend the handbook, and if in their possession would have no need for it unless they become a member.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that American Tower Corporation is a large company, and there are many utility organizations that do not have anything remotely resembling a joint use organization such as the SCJPC, and any entity could extrapolate and/or plagiarize information to their benefit in creating a joint use organization. The handbook is a work in progress, and has been for the last 100 years.

Ms. Hernandez suggested sending the applicant a synopsis of the handbook and the JPA process.

Mr. Chow stated that although the handbook has never been released, the request that the applicant makes is a valid one. The committee is asking members to sign an agreement that points to other documents, it does not appear unreasonable to desire to view any mentioned documents. He added that sending the applicant the JPA training module created by Mr. Rodriguez might answer some

of their questions. He further added that he agrees that when viewing the handbook, the applicant would not truly comprehend it.

Ms. Hernandez stated that in previous discussions, it was proposed to have the applicant in for an interview, early in the process versus later in the process as has been done historically. She added that if the interview transpires early in the process, this would allow the applicant the opportunity to review the handbook and raise questions and concerns in regards to the agreement and all other related documents.

Mr. George inquired if the committee has a non-disclosure form that applicants could sign when given the handbook.

Mr. Chow proposed addressing the concerns the applicant has with the Routine handbook via a phone call, they could visit the JPC office, or they could view the Routine via WebEx. He added that for the future, should the committee receive this type request, the committee should engage legal to draft a non-disclosure form for the Routine handbook. The non-disclosure would not allow disclosure of the handbook to anyone, and they are not to take the information and form a joint use organization.

The members agreed that a non-disclosure form is a good remedy for the future.

Ms. Prescott stated that in regards to the current applicant's request, the applicant needs to submit the application fee, and then would be given the opportunity to view the handbook prior to signing the agreement.

Ms. Corella would contact the applicant with the above-mentioned response.

In the event that the committee should receive this type request in the future, it was agreed to assign an item number to this issue. **Item 1482: Non-Disclosure for Routine Handbook** has been assigned to the Operating committee.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

*There are no special reports*

## **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

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

Mr. Walls reported that the ad hoc met on January 13, 2009. He stated that the primary discussion was about the salvage and depreciation value of alternative to wood poles. He further reported that the ad hoc agreed that the full life of this type poles is forty years. The depreciation schedule for other than wood pole would

be two and one half per cent per year for 24 years. He recommended that members read the minutes of the meeting for further details.

### **Operating Committee**

Mr. Rodriguez reported that Operating met on November 20, 2008. The ad hoc discussed the 2009 operating budget, the upcoming lease expiration, and the attendance penalty fee. He added that the staff appreciation luncheon was discussed, and scheduled. He suggested that members read the minutes for further details. The minutes are available on the SCJPC.net web page.

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

Mr. Wolfe reported that due to time constraints, the Reorganization ad hoc committee did not meet in January.

### **Routine Revision Committee**

Ms. Hernandez reported that the ad hoc met on January 13, 2009. She reported that the ad hoc extensively discussed Section 4.4. She stated that the section alludes to attachment to arms, but does not mention attaching to pole on same grade, and there are instances when an owner desires to attach to the pole on same grade. A sentence has been added to section 4.4, which is on the JPA alert.

She further reported that the ad hoc discussed the safety clearance zone required by wireless members. She stated that originally no utility could attach within the 2 foot SCZ, but a new ruling now states that only antenna owners may attach within the zone. Therefore, the 2 feet would now be purchased by wireless. She added that the revisions to the handbook in regards to this new ruling are on the discussion calendar of today's agenda.

She reported that the ad hoc discussed anchors. She further reported that in regards to anchors, when placing a new anchor, the JPA must notate the type of anchor being placed. AC 111 lists several types; therefore, this AC must be noted. Ms. Baccus interjected that 111g and 111h are for existing anchors, and should be noted on the JPA as well.

Ms. Hernandez encouraged all to read the minutes of the meeting for further details.

### **Computer Communications ad hoc Committee**

Ms. Goetz reported that computer communications did not have an official meeting, but that Mr. Autrey suggested that the ad hoc should make a definite path forward decision. Ms. Goetz added that in regards to SCE, they are in the process of implementing new software for the entire organization. She announced that if the committee would implement iPAM this year, that SCE would not be able to

participate in the implementation process, due to the lengthy implementation process within their organization.

It was agreed that a path forward decision would be discussed at the next ad hoc meeting.

### **Basic JPA Orientation and Training ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Lippert reported that the ad hoc had its first meeting on January 13, 2009. He further reported that initially the ad hoc discussed if the presentation should be a PowerPoint lecture type, or a step-by-step tutorial. The consensus is to take the latter direction. This method would allow users to visit the SCJPC.net web site and utilize the tutorial at their leisure. He then inquired if any members had the opportunity to review the initial draft presentation prepared by Mr. Rodriguez, and if they had any proposed revisions to the presentation. If any members had made some redline revisions to the presentation, he requested that they be sent to him to aid the ad hoc in making revisions to the first draft presentation.

Mr. Wolfe stated at the ad hoc meeting that the presentation would be more user friendly if the presentation used actual members codes rather than the terms, "U1, U2 etc" as is the current method in the handbook. Mr. Lippert inquired if any members would have an objection if their respective member codes were used in the presentation. The attending members responded that they would have no problem if their codes were used in the presentation.

### **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

*No items for consent*

### **DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

#### **Elimination of Section 16.1-B**

Ms. Hernandez reported that the Routine Revision ad hoc is proposing to eliminate section 16.1-B now that the antenna owners are allowed to attach within the 2-foot SCZ, therefore should purchase the SCZ as well.

Ms. Prescott inquired if this type transaction has transpired. Ms. Hernandez responded that if the JPA has not been final billed, then the 2 feet could be purchased. If the JPA has been final billed, then it would remain as is until there is a transaction on that specific pole.

Mr. Autrey suggested leaving the section and chart for the decision on the pole top clearance. Rather than eliminating the chart, the chart could be revised to accommodate the pole top clearance zone.

Ms. Hernandez added that members do not have to purchase the 2-feet if they never intend on using it.

Ms. Prescott stated that it should be noted that there must be a 2-foot clearance, and only the antenna owner may purchase and attach in the SCZ.

After discussion is was agreed that the idea of eliminating this section would be returned to the Routine Revision ad hoc committee for further discussion. **Item 1483: Sections 16.1-B, 3.156, 2.7-I Elimination** has been assigned to the Routine Revision ad hoc committee for rework.

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1423: Standard & Procedures Manual - OPERATING COMMITTEE (09/14/06)
- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS 03/14/07)
- Item 1436: Compliance with Routine - ROUTINE REVISION (03/21/07)
- Item 1440: Review of 1998 Agreement - RE-ORGANIZATION (05/18/07)
- Item 1446: Rev. of Sect. 4.0/4.1 & Rev.of Hdbk-ROUTINE REVISION (08/15/07)
- Item 1451: Wireless Equip. & Restoration Service - ROUTINE REVISION (11/13/07)
- Item 1458: Basic JPA Overview Training - OPERATING COMMITTEE (02/20/08)
- Item 1459: Review of Membership Fee - OPERATING COMMITTEE (02/20/08)
- Item 1462: Sect 7.12 OT Cost/Disaster Replmt - ROUTINE REVISION (04/08/08)
- Item 1469: Salvage Value - AUTHORIZED COSTS (09/09/08)
- Item 1470: Pole Overbuild Reimbursement - ROUTINE REVISION (09/09/08)
- Item 1471: Draft Final Process - ROUTINE REVISION (09/09/08)
- Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement - ROUTINE REVISION (09/17/08)
- Item 1475: 2010 Operating Budget - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1476: Lease Expiration - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1477: Review AC for Travel Time - AUTHORIZED COSTS (11/05/08)
- Item 1479: Review By-Laws Art. V & VI - RE-ORGANIZATION (11/17/08)
- Item 1481: American Tower Mbrship App. - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)

The members reviewed the open items and noted which items could be closed at this time.

**Item 1485: *Environmental Issues***

This is a standing open item.

**New Business**

***Known Items:***

There were no know items for discussion

**Unknown Items:**

*Authorized Costs for GPA Info – Verizon California*

Mr. Cashmer is proposing an authorized cost for providing GPS information to be placed on the pole records. He is of the opinion that this type information would be valuable to fellow members. Mr. Cashmer stated that if you have acquired the GPS info for a specific pole, list it on JPA to be recorded on the pole card record, and charge the approved cost for the info. He added that this info would be valuable in rural areas, and is proposing a minimal cost of \$2.00 per pole.

Ms. Prescott stated that she is in agreement with Mr. Cashmer that this info could be of value especially if the info was on all pole records, however, she added that she is not in agreement or believes that it warrants a cost. She further added that there should be a place on the JPA to list the GPS info, and moving forward place this info on the pole record.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that this info could be placed on the location section of the JPA. He added that listing the lat and long is a requirement of his organization.

Mr. Chow clarified that all are in agreement that this type information is of value to all, however, the question is whether there should be an established authorized cost to this transaction.

After discussion it was agreed that this issue be assigned to an ad hoc for further discussion. **Item 1484: GPS Added to Section 15.4** has been assigned to the Routine Revision ad hoc committee. If it is agreed within the Routine ad hoc committee that this action warrants an authorized cost, then the item would be added to the authorize costs ad hoc committee agenda.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Routine Revision	02/10/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Computer Committee	02/10/09	Following	Routine Revision
Authorized Costs	02/10/09	Following	Computer Committee
Reorganization	02/10/09	Following	Authorized Costs
Basic JPA Tr/Orientation	02/10/09	Following	Reorganization
Administrative Board	02/18/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	02/18/09	Following.	Administrative Board

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Hernandez adjourned the meeting at 10.25 a.m., until February 18, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez, President.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operation

## 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, 2009

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. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Ms. Shawna De Bois	NextG Networks (teleconference)
Mr. Cory Autrey	Sprint-Nextel/Sprint Communications
Mr. Randall Starkey	Time Warner Cable (teleconference)
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Mr. Mark Denning	M-Power-Telepacific (teleconference)
Mr. Rich Rolita	CA Clec LLC (teleconference)
Mr. Varghese George	City of Glendale
Mr. Mahendra Garg	City of Anaheim
Mr. Dan Kjar	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc (teleconference)
Mr. Daniel Lippert	City of Burbank
Ms. Annetta Baker	City of Colton (teleconference)
Mr. Scott Hunter	City of Los Angeles (teleconference)
Ms. Patti Ringo	ExteNet Systems (teleconference)
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena (teleconference)
Mr. Gary Hironimus	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Ms. Maryam Farajzadeh	City of Vernon
Mr. Justin Cashmer	Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Steve Rodriguez	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Michael Glassey	AT&T Communications/Local Serv.
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Roger Ohms	City of Banning
Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Don Beckermann	MCI Communications/Metro
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Committee president Ms. Goetz called the meeting to order at 9:10 am. When all teleconferencing members were accounted for, Ms. Goetz allowed for introductions. She reminded all members to state their name prior to speaking, and notify the chair if they leave the conference.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Ms. Goetz asked the members to review the January 21, 2009 Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. Mr. Autrey noted a typo on page 7, the term GPS is typed as GPA. The typo has been noted. In that there were no further corrections to the minutes, Mr. Autrey motioned to accept the minutes as corrected. Mr. Garg seconded the motion, which upon voting, passed unanimously.

**MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the January 2009 budget expenses are \$58,977.79. She added that the month of January reflects a three payroll-period month, therefore, the expenses are above average. The members were fully assessed this amount.

**COMMUNICATIONS:**

Ms. Corella reported that American Tower Corporation has requested to review the Routine Handbook. The board agreed that the membership applicant could visit the office and view the handbook if so desired. Ms. Corella further reported that she relayed this information to the applicant, and the applicant responded that they would get back to her. She stated that later she received a call from the applicant inquiring about time frames within the JPA process. She relayed the request to the committee supervisor, Ms. Baccus. Ms. Baccus reported that she contacted the applicant via telephone and left a message on voicemail. To date the applicant has not responded.

The applicant request would remain open at this time.

**SPECIAL REPORTS**

*There are no special reports*

## **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

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

Mr. Hunter reported that the ad hoc committee met on February 10, 2009. The core discussion of the meeting was salvage value for other than wood poles. He added that the salvage value schedules are available on the web.

### **Operating Committee**

Mr. Rodriguez reported that Operating met on January 21, 2009. He suggested that members read the minutes for all details. The minutes are available on the SCJPC.net web page.

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

In the absence of Mr. Wolfe, Ms. Corella reported that the ad hoc met on February 10, 2009. She added that there was extensive discussion on poles left in field, and recommended that members read the minutes available on the committee website.

### **Routine Revision Committee**

Ms. Hernandez reported that the ad hoc met on February 10, 2009. She reported that the ad hoc discussed the situation when a member has rearranged facilities in the field and there is a foot lost by some members, and gained by another member (the base owner) that did not desire the additional foot. The concern within the ad hoc is the billing directive to be documented for the JPA staff. The ad hoc would continue to discuss this issue. Ms. Hernandez urged members to join this discussion in that it might impact them.

The ad hoc also discussed the draft final, which was proposed by AT&T California. It is a step in the JPA process that is implemented in the North, and AT&T California is proposing implementation in the South. The JPC office is to provide the ad hoc with a list of causes as to why final JPAs are being returned to the initiators. This should aid in determining if there is any value to the final draft process. She encouraged members to review the minutes for details.

### **Computer Communications ad hoc Committee**

Ms. Goetz reported that computer communications did not meet in February 2009.

## **Basic JPA Orientation and Training ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Lippert reported that the ad hoc met on February 10, 2009. The draft of the training module is now available on the web for members to view from the MEMBERS drop down menu on the Notice of meetings and agendas page. He added that it has been recommended that this ad hoc meet on a day when there are no other meetings scheduled.

### **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

*No items for consent*

### **DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

#### *Revisions to By-Laws – Article I (d)*

Ms. Goetz read the proposed revisions to the By-Laws reflected on the first 3 pages (see attachment).

Ms. Prescott stated that the by-laws state that, “*The President, Vice-President, and ~~three~~ elective members of the Operating Committee shall be elected at the annual meeting of the Administrative Board*”. She inquired that the board should be notified when that ANNUAL meeting is scheduled to transpire.

After some discussion, the consensus is to memorialize when the nominating committee is to meet, and at what Board meeting are officers approved. The following verbiage to address this issue is as follows, “Nominating committee meeting is held in November. The annual board meeting for elections meets in January of the following year.”

Ms. Goetz solicited a motion to accept the revisions to the by-laws. Ms. Hernandez motioned to accept the revisions to the by-laws, and Ms. Haney seconded the motion. Ms. Goetz collected all member votes, and the motion passed unanimously.

#### *Addition to Operating committee members*

Mr. Autrey stated that two major members are not on the slate of members of the operating committee. Those members are AT&T California, and City of Los Angeles. It was agreed at the operating committee that those members with the greatest interest vested in the SCJPC should always be assigned to the operating committee. When viewing the officers on the web site, the two members in question are noted, but were never officially approved. It was agreed to formally vote the two members into the operating committee. Mr. Autrey motioned to formally accept AT&T California, and City of Los Angeles into the operating committee. Ms. Hernandez seconded the motion, which upon voting passed unanimously.

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1423: Standard & Procedures Manual - OPERATING COMMITTEE (09/14/06)
- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS 03/14/07)
- Item 1436: Compliance with Routine - ROUTINE REVISION (03/21/07)
- Item 1440: Review of 1998 Agreement - RE-ORGANIZATION (05/18/07)
- Item 1446: Rev. of Sect. 4.0/4.1 & Rev.of Hdbk-ROUTINE REVISION (08/15/07)
- Item 1458: Basic JPA Overview Training - OPERATING COMMITTEE (02/20/08)
- Item 1462: Sect 7.12 OT Cost/Disaster Replmt - ROUTINE REVISION (04/08/08)
- Item 1469: Salvage Value - AUTHORIZED COSTS (09/09/08)
- Item 1470: Pole Overbuild Reimbursement - ROUTINE REVISION (09/09/08)
- Item 1471: Draft Final Process - ROUTINE REVISION (09/09/08)
- Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement - ROUTINE REVISION (09/17/08)
- Item 1475: 2010 Operating Budget - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1476: Lease Expiration - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1477: Review AC for Travel Time - AUTHORIZED COSTS (11/05/08)
- Item 1479: Review By-Laws Art. V & VI - RE-ORGANIZATION (11/17/08)
- Item 1481: American Tower Mbrship App. - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1482: Non-Disclosure for Handbook - OPERATING COMMITTEE (1/21/09)
- Item 1483: Section 16.1-B Elimination - ROUTINE REVISION (01/21/09)
- Item 1484: GPS added to Section 15.4 - ROUTINE REVISION (01/21/09)
- Item 1485: Final Initiation Requirements - ROUTINE REVISION (01/21/09)

There was no discussion on any open items.

**Item 1485: *Environmental Issues***

This is a standing open item.

**New Business**

***Known Items:***

There were no know items for discussion

**Unknown Items:**

*Approved Maintenance/inspection Programs – Sprint/Nextel*

Mr. Autrey inquired into those members who have an approved maintenance/inspection program. Those members with an approved program are listed in section 2.7-H. Mr. Autrey then inquired if the documents supporting the maintenance programs are available on the website, and if not how could he acquire approved program documents.

Ms. Corella responded that she should have copies of the documents, which could include their MSDS, and other supporting documents for members approved maintenance programs. She would attempt to gain the documents for the seven members listed in the Routine Handbook.

Mr. George stated that he would also like to review the documents, in that the City of Glendale would like the opportunity to present their maintenance program for Board approval.

*AT&T California and Poles left in field – City of Anaheim*

Mr. Garg reported that the City of Anaheim has a concern with AT&T California in that they are leaving side-by-side poles in the field. In the past he had worked out a procedure with Ms. Prouty, the previous representative, where he would submit a list to Ms. Prouty and she would address the pole issue. This procedure was working out well in that there was progress in this concern.

Mr. Garg stated that there is an association called SCPPA, acronym for Southern California Public Power Association, where Anaheim, Burbank, and City of Los Angeles are members to name a few. He further reported that these fellow municipalities are experiencing the similar issue with AT&T California. Mr. Lippert added that he believes this problem is statewide among power.

Mr. Garg questioned that since the SCJPC has identified an approved contractors list within the organization, the members could contract approved contractors to handle the work for AT&T California if they have a shortage of resources to address this issue. However, his concern is how would the transaction transpire, and who would indemnify the contractor. He further questioned if this is the correct forum for this issue, and what other options does a member have in this situation.

Ms. Hernandez responded that prior to Anaheim moving forward with this action, she would like to make Mr. Garg aware that Mr. Wolfe of AT&T California is well aware of this issue. She added that Mr. Wolfe is not in attendance at this time, but at the last Reorganization meeting, he brought this issue to the table and reported that AT&T California has and continues to reorganize, and one of their primary objectives is to address the backlog of poles left in field. Therefore, Ms. Hernandez recommended that Mr. Garg should contact Mr. Wolfe with this concern prior to moving forward in any other direction. She further stated that he voiced at the reorganization meeting that members allow at least until the end of March to

allow the newly formed organization to get settled, since now they have been given the funds for this project.

Mr. Garg stated that if an approved contractor is engaged for this task, the costs would be billed to AT&T California via section 1.2 on a JPA, or special billing.

Ms. Goetz stated that prior to moving forward with this plan, the other member must be notified and allowed ample time to rectify the problem.

Mr. George inquired how the SCJPC handles conflict as such between members.

Ms. Hernandez responded that currently, there is nothing addressing this issue in the agreement; however, the reorganization ad hoc committee is currently working on a plan to handle those members who are not compliant with the procedures in the Routine Handbook.

The consensus is that Mr. Garg, and any other members experiencing this similar situation, contact Mr. Robert Wolfe directly.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Basic JPA Tr/Orientation	03/04/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Routine Revision	03/10/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Computer Committee	03/10/09	Following	Routine Revision
Authorized Costs	03/10/09	Following	Computer Committee
Reorganization	03/10/09	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	03/18/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	03/18/09	Following.	Administrative Board

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Goetz adjourned the meeting at 10.15 a.m., until March 18, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Sherri Goetz, President.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operation

# ATTACHMENT

## SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

### BY-LAWS

January 1, 1998

### ARTICLE I

#### Definition of Terms

(a) Administrative Board: A board composed of one authorized representative of each Member.

(b) President: The annually elected office of the President shall consist of an authorized representative of the Administrative Board and shall be chosen on a rotational basis from the total membership. The President shall serve for a period of one year without compensation from the Committee.

(c) Vice-President: The annually elected office of the Vice-President shall consist of an authorized representative of the Administrative Board. The Vice-President shall serve for a period of one year without compensation from the Committee.

(d) Operating Committee: A Committee consisting of ~~at least four Members that includes the Vice-President and~~ at least three elective Members. ~~The first elective Member shall be chosen from an electric power utility Member, and the second from a communication utility Member. The third elective and any other participating Committee Member(s) may be drawn from the general membership.~~

### ARTICLE II

#### Elections

##### Section 1

The President, Vice-President, and ~~three~~ elective members of the Operating Committee shall be elected at the annual meeting of the Administrative Board.

##### Section 2

The Administrative Board may hold a special election at any time to fill any vacancy that may occur by reason of the death, disability, resignation, or removal of any of such officers or members of the Operating Committee.

##### Section 3

The President, Vice-President and each member of the Operating Committee, shall take office upon expiration of the term of office of his/her predecessor and, unless removed by the Administrative Board, shall hold such office for a period of one year, or until a successor is elected.

### ARTICLE III

#### Powers and Duties of the Administrative Board

##### Section 1

The Administrative Board shall annually in October establish pole price schedules through the recommendations of the ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements in accordance with the Joint Pole Routine Handbook. Such schedules shall become effective on January 1 of the next succeeding year.

#### Section 2

The Administrative Board shall bi-annually in October establish Authorized Costs through the recommendations of the ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements in accordance with the Joint Pole Routine Handbook. Such costs shall become effective on January 1 of the next succeeding year.

#### Section 3

The Administrative Board shall hear disputes among members involving interpretations of the Joint Pole Routine Handbook and render decisions thereon in keeping with the intent of the Routine Handbook.

#### Section 4

The Administrative Board shall evaluate net worth for membership consideration of privately or publicly owned utilities. Such consideration shall include, but not be limited to the following:

- (a) Ability of the applicant to pay for the administration, installation, repair, and maintenance of its existing and proposed facilities;
- (b) Ability of the applicant to demonstrate proof of sufficient insurance, self insurance, or the financial ability to defend and to respond in damages to the kind of litigation usually incident to a utility business of the size of the applicant; and
- (c) Maintenance of (a) and (b).
- (d) The Administrative Board shall request a letter of credit, surety bond, or deposit in an amount proportionate to two years average assessment.
- (e) Each member may additionally request a letter of credit, surety bond or deposit in the amount proportionate to their estimated build-out.

#### Section 5

The Administrative Board shall appoint a Nominating Committee annually in November to determine the slate of officers for the following term as well as elect the ~~three~~ elective Members of the Operating Committee for the following year.

#### Section 6

The Administrative Board shall appoint a Committee Office Manager and fix compensation therefore. The Office Manager shall perform the duties as outlined in Article VII, Sections 1&2 of these By-Laws and shall be subject to discipline, suspension, or discharge at the discretion of the Administrative Board and by recommendation of the Operating Committee.

#### Section 7

The Administrative Board, by recommendation of the Operating Committee, shall fix the compensation of the Committee Office Staff.

## **ARTICLE IV**

### **Powers and Duties of the President**

#### Section 1

The President shall preside at all Administrative Board meetings. The President may appoint and dissolve committees, as necessary, to carry out assignments. The President is authorized to co-sign checks on behalf of the Committee, subject to the restrictions set forth in the Agreement and these By-Laws.

## **ARTICLE V**

### **Powers and Duties of the Vice-President**

#### Section 1

In the absence of the President, the Vice-President shall preside at the Administrative Board meeting and have the powers and perform the duties of the President. The Vice-President, as Chairman of the Operating Committee and under the direction of the Administrative Board, will direct and support the Office Manager in the operation of the Joint Pole Office. The Vice-President is authorized to co-sign checks on behalf of the Committee, subject to the restrictions set forth in the Agreement and these By-Laws.

## **ARTICLE VI**

### **Powers and Duties of the Operating Committee**

#### Section 1

The Operating Committee shall consist of the Vice-President and ~~three~~ elective members. The Vice-President shall be the chairperson. In the event of his/her absence, a designee shall preside over the meeting.

#### Section 2

Joint Pole Office practices and procedures require the approval of the Operating Committee. The Operating Committee shall review and investigate such practices and procedures for the purpose of effecting improvements therein. The Operating Committee shall continually review the operations of the Joint Pole Office and, as necessary, recommend changes to the Administrative Board related to improving those operations. The Operating Committee is authorized to approve reasonable expenditures for supplies and services necessary for the operation of the Joint Pole Office in amounts up to \$5,000 in each instance.

## **ARTICLE VII**

### **Powers and Duties of the Office Manager**

#### Section 1

The Office Manager shall manage the Joint Pole Office and shall report directly to the Vice-President. The Office Manager shall be responsible for maintaining the records; for performing the work connected with recording and pricing of transactions for the joint use of poles and their apparatus or equipment; and for preparing monthly bills of sale for Members reflecting all sales, transfers of ownership, and related joint use activities. With the approval of the Operating Committee, the Office Manager may employ, discipline, suspend, discharge and prescribe the duties of personnel necessary for the performance of all functions of the Office. The Office Manager shall sign all reports and documents of a factual nature required by governmental and other agencies in the normal course of business. The Office Manager shall be responsible for the maintenance and administration of the Committee Office computer system. The Office Manager shall notify each Member of all regular or special meetings stating the business that will be presented for consideration. The Office Manager shall attend all meetings, prepare agendas, and be responsible for recording the proceedings thereof.

## Southern California Joint Pole Committee

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

March 18, 2009

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. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Ms. Bridgette Courtney	Golden State Wtr (teleconference)
Mr. Cory Autrey	Sprint-Nextel/Sprint Communications
Mr. Randall Starkey	Time Warner Cable (teleconference)
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Mr. Mark Denning	M-Power-Telepacific (teleconference)
Mr. Pedro Miraz	CA Clec LLC (teleconference)
Mr. Varghese George	City of Glendale
Mr. Mahendra Garg	City of Anaheim
Mr. Dan Kjar	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc
Mr. Daniel Lippert	City of Burbank
Mr. Rex Myers	City of Colton (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Scott Hunter	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Patti Ringo	ExteNet Systems (teleconference)
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena (teleconference)
Mr. Gary Hironimus	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Ms. Maryam Farajzadeh	City of Vernon
Mr. Justin Cashmer	Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Steve Rodriguez	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Michael Glassey	AT&T Communications/Local Serv.
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Roger Ohms	City of Banning
Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Don Beckermann	MCI Comm./Metro (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

Guests: Mr. Wade Martin

InTec Services, Inc.

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Committee president Ms. Goetz called the meeting to order at 9:05 am. When all attending and teleconferencing members were accounted for, Ms. Goetz allowed for introductions. She reminded all members to state their name prior to speaking and speak as clearly as possible.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Ms. Goetz asked the members to review the February 18, 2009 Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. After reviewing the minutes, Ms. Goetz inquired if there were any comments or revisions. There was no response. Ms. Goetz then solicited for a motion to accept the minutes as written. Mr. Rodriguez motioned to accept the minutes as written, and Mr. Garg seconded the motion, which upon voting passed unanimously.

### **MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the February 2009 budget expenses are \$41,595.55. She added that the month of January reflects an average month. The members were fully assessed this amount.

### **COMMUNICATIONS:**

Ms. Corella reported that she has not received any further communication from American Tower Corporation.

She further reported that she received a request from a lawyer who resides in Washington D.C. He states that his client would like a copy of the 1998 Agreement to review prior to applying for committee membership. She added that his client is willing to submit the non-refundable application fee of \$725.00 for the allowance of gaining a copy of the Agreement. Mr. Corella stated that she has never received this type of request. She added that the caller would not disclose the name of his client. She stated that a step early in the application process is to send the applicant a copy of the agreement upon receipt of the application fee. The issue is should the committee release the agreement to an entity prior to applying for membership.

Mr. Wolfe commented that this request is reasonable in that an entity would like to read the agreement prior to applying for membership. He added that releasing the document to an outside entity, the outside party should understand that they are not allowed to copy the document or use it for personal use other than to review the document(s).

Ms. Hernandez remarked that in her opinion it appears odd that the lawyer would not disclose the name of his client.

Ms. Haney proposed contacting the committee attorney in reference to this request.

After discussion, the consensus is to contact committee legal to inquire if releasing the agreement is a prudent action, and if so, to draft a non-disclosure statement.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

### *Maintenance/Inspection Program Presentation-City of Lompoc/Mr.Dana Fabing.*

Mr. Fabing introduced Mr. Wade Martin and his aid Chris. He stated that the presentation is the application to gain an approved maintenance/inspection program per Section 19.5 and Section 2.7-H. He then distributed copies of the pertinent documents to support his presentation. The documents include a pole inspection and GO 95 compliance summary from the Lompoc assistant manager, the agreement between InTec Services and the City of Lompoc, the purchase order, specifications for treatment and preservation of wood poles, and MSDS sheets.

Mr. Wolfe inquired who were the primary joint owners with Lompoc. Mr. Fabing responded that the greatest percentage is Verizon California.

The members discussed inspection costs and it was brought to Mr. Fabing's attention that there are current established agreed upon inspection authorized costs in the handbook. Ms. Haney inquired if Mr. Fabing is comfortable with the set inspection costs in the Routine. Mr. Fabing responded that the City of Lompoc has no problem with the current costs.

Mr. Cashmer stated that since the greatest percentage of joint ownership is with Verizon California, he informed Mr. Fabing that the policy within Verizon California is to replace the pole rather than repair it. Mr. Fabing responded that this situation would require a meet between the City of Lompoc and Verizon California prior to commencing with their inspection program.

The members posed further inquiries to Mr. Fabing and Mr. Martin, to which both parties provided responses.

After extensive dialogue, Ms. Goetz inquired if the members were prepared to vote on the City of Lompoc maintenance/inspection program. Ms. Haney motioned to accept the maintenance/inspection program for the City of Lompoc. Ms. Hernandez seconded the motion. The members approved the program, with the exception of Verizon California who registered a no vote on approving the program. The motion carried, the approval date would be effective today. The approved program date would be documented in the Routine Handbook, Section 2.7-H.

## **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

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

Mr. Walls reported that the ad hoc met on March 10, 2009. The primary issue discussed at the meeting is Item 1477: Review of authorized costs for Travel time. The consensus is that all members involved in the joint pole transaction would require some travel time therefore; it appears that the travel time for all involved is offset among themselves. It was agreed that this item should be closed.

### **Operating Committee**

Mr. Autrey reported that the operating committee met on February 18, 2009. The members reviewed the monthly standing items. He added that the ad hoc is reviewing the JPC office activity via graphs to determine if the office is sufficiently staffed or understaffed. The ad hoc is currently reviewing each line item of the operating expenses in preparation for the 2010 budget. A primary issue within the committee is the expiration of the current office lease, which expires in October 2009. The committee is in the process of considering other properties, as well as preparing for negotiations with the current property management. The committee has nearly completed the JPC staff emergency handbook.

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

Mr. Wolfe reported that the ad hoc met on March 10, 2009. He reported that the members discussed the issue of members out of compliance with the Routine and poles left in the field. Also being discussed is the objective of reviewing the 1998 Agreement. The ad hoc continues to review the agreement.

### **Routine Revision Committee**

Ms. Hernandez reported that the ad hoc met on March 10, 2009. She reported that billing directives were clarified for sections 2.7-F and G, which is concerned with salvage. Ms. Hernandez inquired if Verizon California desires to continue to address item 1484: GPS added to Section 15.4. She added that since Verizon California was not represented at the last ad hoc meeting, the consensus is to close the item number. She further added that the attending members had no concerns with the item number. It was agreed that if a member has the GPS information, to list it on the JPA, but also agreed is that there should not be an authorized cost for the information. Ms. Hernandez stated that if Verizon California should decide to re-open this issue, a new item number would be assigned.

The members discussed the proposal submitted by SCE for Section 4.1; this issue would be discussed further at the next meeting. Ms. Hernandez urged those members interested in this section to plan on attending the next Routine Revision ad hoc meeting.

She further reported that the ad hoc continues to discuss the issue of one member rearranging a pole, which results in an additional foot of space. The question is what to do with that extra foot of space.

Ms. Hernandez stated that at the ad hoc she raised the issue of when a pole is placed in the same hole, and power cuts the pole, communication does share in the cost of the cutting. She added that this is the method in which she was originally trained. She further added that she does not have a problem with paying the cost, but she would like to get input on how other members view this action.

Mr. Wolfe responded that from a communication perspective he agrees with Ms. Hernandez and that pulling the butt compensates power.

Mr. Walls responded that from the DWP perspective, in terms of cutting the pole there is no difference if you set the pole in the same hole or set the pole next to the old pole. When DWP tops a pole, 75% of the time the cost of 5-C is shared. The reason behind this logic is that both parties need the pole topped to facilitate the transfer of both facilities.

The members discussed various scenarios in regards to cut and kick. Ms. Hernandez concluded by stating that this issue requires additional discussion within the Routine ad hoc committee, and encourages members to attend the Routine meeting.

### **Computer Communications ad hoc Committee**

Ms. Goetz reported that computer communications met on March 10, 2009. She added that Sprint-Nextel stated that the ad hoc should come to a decision of either aggressively moving forward with iPAM, or reach an agreement that they should no longer commit resources toward the development of iPAM. The consensus is to contact Hyperlink, and request that the iPAM program is demonstrated by processing a JPA from initiation to completion for a pole replacement transaction. This is to ascertain the status of the software to determine it has the ability to be launched.

Mr. Autrey reiterated his thoughts. He stated that the ad hoc should determine if they desire to continue committing the resources to this project, or to decide to terminate it.

### **Basic JPA Orientation and Training ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Lippert reported that the ad hoc met on March 4, 2009. The latest copy of the training module is now available on the web for members to view from the MEMBERS drop down menu on the Notice of meetings and agendas page. He added that currently the voltage information for power and antenna information for communication is listed on the heading. This information does not necessarily

apply to all poles. It was suggested to list this information above the line of the pole. He inquired if the members are in agreement. The members agreed to list this type information as suggested.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

*No items for consent*

**DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

*No items for consent*

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS 03/14/07)
- Item 1436: Compliance with Routine - ROUTINE REVISION (03/21/07)
- Item 1440: Review of 1998 Agreement - RE-ORGANIZATION (05/18/07)
- Item 1446: Rev. of Sect. 4.0/4.1 & Rev.of Hdbk-ROUTINE REVISION (08/15/07)
- Item 1458: Basic JPA Overview Training - OPERATING COMMITTEE (02/20/08)
- Item 1462: Sect 7.12 OT Cost/Disaster Replmt - ROUTINE REVISION (04/08/08)
- Item 1470: Pole Overbuild Reimbursement - ROUTINE REVISION (09/09/08)
- Item 1471: Draft Final Process - ROUTINE REVISION (09/09/08)
- Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement - ROUTINE REVISION (09/17/08)
- Item 1475: 2010 Operating Budget - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1476: Lease Expiration - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1477: Review AC for Travel Time - AUTHORIZED COSTS (11/05/08)
- Item 1481: American Tower Mbrship App. - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1482: Non-Disclosure for Handbook - OPERATING COMMITTEE (1/21/09)
- Item 1483: Section 16.1-B Elimination - ROUTINE REVISION (01/21/09)
- Item 1484: GPS added to Section 15.4 - ROUTINE REVISION (01/21/09)
- Item 1485: Final Initiation Requirements - ROUTINE REVISION (01/21/09)

It was noted that items 1470, 1477, and 1484 are closed.

**Item 1485: *Environmental Issues***

This is a standing open item.

## **New Business**

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

#### *Maintenance/Inspection Program Documents-Sprint/Nextel*

Mr. Autrey stated that he requested the support documents for the maintenance/inspection programs for those members with approved programs. Ms. Corella responded that due to time constraints she was unable to collect the documents, but would have the documents by the next meeting.

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

#### *DWP Area Responsibility Map-City of Los Angeles*

Mr. Walls reported that the area of responsibility map, and planner contacts for DWP would shortly become available on the web site.

#### *Wind loading calcs – City of Anaheim*

Mr. Garg reported that wind loading has become an issue within the City of Anaheim. He inquired if SCE requires wind-loading calcs. Ms. Goetz responded that SCE requires wind-loading calcs when members submit their JPAs. Mr. Garg stated he would like to implement a similar requirement as SCE. It was agreed that the request would be discussed further at the next Routine Revision meeting.

Mr. Wolfe inquired of SCE just what is required of members in this situation. Ms. Goetz responded the cable diameter, size and weight.

Ms. Hernandez stated that other members are not certain of the SCE facilities. It is her belief that SCE requires the other member's information because they are aware of the information on their facilities. SCE takes all this information and performs wind-loading calculations within their organization prior to approving the JPA. She added that it is also her understanding that the only time wind-loading calcs are required from other members is when SCE requests it.

Ms. Goetz stated that this issue is slated to be discussed further at the next Routine Revision ad hoc meeting, and any members concerned with wind loading should plan on attending the meeting.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Basic JPA Tr/Orientation	04/07/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Routine Revision	04/14/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Computer Committee	04/14/09	Following	Routine Revision
Authorized Costs	04/14/09	Following	Computer Committee
Reorganization	04/14/09	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	04/15/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	04/15/09	Following.	Administrative Board

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Goetz adjourned the meeting at 11.30 a.m., until April 15, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Sherri Goetz, President.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operation

## Southern California Joint Pole Committee

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

May 20, 2009

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. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Mr. Cory Autrey	Sprint-Nextel/Sprint Communications
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Mr. Rich Rolita	CA Clec LLC (teleconference)
Ms. Charito De Castro	City of Glendale
Mr. Dan Kjar	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Scott Hunter	City of Los Angeles - DWP
Mr. Rudy	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Mr. Mahendra Garg	City of Anaheim
Mr. Doug Schmaderer	City of Pasadena
Mr. Randall Starkey	Time-Warner (teleconference)
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc (teleconference)
Mr. Mark Denning	M-Power/Telepacific (teleconference)
Mr. Rex Myers	City of Colton (teleconference)
Ms. Bridget Courtney	Golden State Water (teleconference)
Ms. Maryam Farajzadeh	City of Vernon (teleconference)
Mr. Justin Cashmer	Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Steve Rodriguez	T-Mobile USA (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Michael Glassey	AT&T Comm/Local Serv(teleconference)
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Mr. Roger Ohms	City of Banning
Mr. Ihab Ibrahim	City of Banning
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

## **CALL TO ORDER:**

Committee president Mr. Chow called the meeting to order at 9:05 am and allowed for introductions. The roll was taken from the member roster to ensure that all attending and WebEx teleconferencing members were accounted for.

## **HOUSEKEEPING:**

Mr. Chow informed the attendees of the locations of the restrooms and the exits in the event of an emergency. He then distributed the lunch menus for those members that intended on remaining through lunch.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Mr. Chow asked the members to review the April 15, 2009 Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. There were no revisions to the minutes. Ms. Hernandez motioned to accept the minutes as written; Ms. Prescott seconded the motion, which upon voting passed unanimously.

## **MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the April 2009 budget expenses are \$44,021.90. She added that the month of April reflects an average month. The members were fully assessed this amount.

## **COMMUNICATIONS:**

### *Item 1482: Non-Disclosure for Handbook*

Ms. Corella reported that she has received a response from Mr. Adams, (see attachment) the committee legal, in reference to the question of allowing outside entities to view the SCJPC 1998 Agreement and the Routine Handbook. She proceeded to read the communications to the members. Mr. Autrey remarked that in regards to the Agreement, interested parties should be allowed to view the document. However, in his opinion, pertaining to the Routine Handbook, interested parties need to officially apply for membership, pay the application fee and sign the NDS prior to be given the opportunity to review the Routine Handbook. The consensus among the members is in agreement with Mr. Autrey's statement. Mr. Autrey added that the ad hoc Operating committee would be further discussing the item at their next meeting.

## SpidaWeb LLC

Ms. Corella reported that she received a telephone call from Mr. Wil Schulze president of SpidaWeb LLC. He is inquiring if any members are interested in a software application that coordinates activities on poles and manages the data involved with inspections. The email received by Ms. Corella and the power point slides provided by SpidaWeb were presented to the members. It was agreed that the SpidaWeb power point slides be made available on the SCJPC.net website to allow interested members to view the presentation at their leisure.

Mr. Wolfe stated that he is familiar with the software company and they are well versed in the joint pole transactions, functions and operations.

Mr. Chow inquired of Mr. Wolfe if SpidaWeb has the expertise and could be a resource in aiding the committee with the iPAM development and status. Mr. Wolfe responded that he believes they do have the knowledge and expertise of the joint pole environment. He added that they could act as a consultant to the committee. Mr. Chow thanked Mr. Wolfe for his positive recommendation and added that this issue would be discussed further at the ad hoc Computer Communications committee meeting.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

### *IPAM Software demonstration – Hyperlink Technology*

Mr. Atalla commenced his presentation at 10:00 am. He opened by giving a brief description of the application for the benefit of those members unfamiliar with the specifications of the iPAM application. He proceeded to display the screens required in navigating the application. Mr. Atalla stated that their objective was to create an electronic process that mimics the current manual processing of JPAs.

He demonstrated the navigation and data retrieval associated with the JPA screen, which is the most often viewed screen. He added that the screen has the ability to accept up to nine members.

Mr. Atalla entered a JPA and put it through the different status of JPAs, which is draft, submitted, approved and ready to bill modes.

The members posed questions to Mr. Atalla in regards to the operation of the software. He answered the questions, and made notations on those that he was unable to answer at the time.

Mr. Atalla demonstrated the capabilities of a Form 7 and Form 48.

He stressed the need of the members taking the application and testing it among themselves.

Mr. Atalla stated that the current iPAM application addresses the preliminary process. It has been programmed to eventually interface with the automatic billing phase of the application. He added that one objective is to automate the billing process.

Ms. Prescott remarked that in her opinion the application appears to operate well and as expected. She added that she noticed enhancements to the application

since the last time she tested it, and in her opinion looks great. She agrees that working the application by processing a real time JPA would result in identifying any inconsistencies. Ms. Prescott agrees with the need to test the software, and volunteered to be a part of the iPAM application-testing group. Ms. Hernandez, and Ms. Haney also volunteered. Mr. Chow stated if SCE could fit the testing into their schedules, they would gladly be a part of the test group. Mr. Hunter stated that he would inquire and confirm with Mr. Walls if DWP would be a part of the testing group.

The members thanked Mr. Atalla for his time and demonstration. The test group will meet to discuss details.

## **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

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

Mr. Hunter reported that the authorized costs elements ad hoc committee met on May 12, 2009. He further reported that AC item 10-A could be used in a temporary repair or permanent repair. This issue is now closed. He recommended members read the minutes posted on the SCJPC web site for further details.

### **Operating Committee**

Mr. Autrey reported that the operating committee met on April 15, 2009. He reported that the ad hoc reviewed the standing monthly agenda items. The ad hoc discussed the operating budget and those items that should be assessed proportionately versus equally. The current budget would not be revised, but the members would address each budget line item in preparation for next years budget.

The JPC office lease expires this October, therefore, the ad hoc members are discussing possible re-location properties and have visited several sites for consideration.

The committee is discussing procuring an off-site server to back up and mirror the data in the JPC office server as disaster recovery. There will be a presentation today within the operating committee meeting by the company being considered as the back-up provider.

Lastly, Mr. Autrey reported that the SCJPC Emergency Handbook has been approved and distributed to the staff. The members would continue working on a contingency plan.

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

Mr. Wolfe reported that the ad hoc met on May 12, 2009. He reported that the ad hoc members agreed to have their respective legal departments review Section 11 of the 1998 Agreement for interpretation and clarification. The ad hoc would continue to collaborate on reviewing the remainder of the Agreement commencing with Section 12 at the next meeting.

### **Routine Revision Committee**

Ms. Hernandez reported that the ad hoc met on May 12, 2009. She reported that SCE presented details pertaining to their wind-loading program. She added that the SCE guests answered all questions posed to them by the members. She further reported that the ad hoc committee is in agreement that some processes and criteria for wind loading must be identified and perhaps become a part of the joint pole routine. To this it was agreed that an ad hoc committee be formed to address the issue of wind loading. The members would determine what wind loading data should be included in the JPA.

She further reported that Hyperlink Technology would be including the pole class, the GPS data, and the old pole number on the new pole card, and cross reference the new number on the old pole card number.

She added that Mr. Robert Wolfe provided the Routine ad hoc with some diagram job aids in alternative methods for placing poles that cannot be placed in the same hole. The diagrams illustrate where not to and where to place a pole in various job situations. The members viewed and discussed the diagrams. Ms. Hernandez added that the diagrams are an attachment to the May 12, 2009 Routine Revision Meeting minutes should any members desire to view or download them.

Mr. Wolfe added that the diagrams were created by Mr. Brian Morrow of PG&E and is not opposed to members using the diagrams as a job aide tool.

Ms. Hernandez closed by stating that the minutes are lengthy and informative and recommends all members review the minutes for further details.

### **Computer Communications ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Chow reported that Computer Communications did not meet this month due to the iPAM demonstration scheduled for this meeting.

### **Basic JPA Orientation and Training ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Lippert was not in attendance to report on this ad hoc committee meeting. However, the May 7 2009 meeting minutes are available on the SCJPC.net web site for review.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

*No items for consent*

**DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

*No items for consent*

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS 03/14/07)
- Item 1440: Review of 1998 Agreement - RE-ORGANIZATION (05/18/07)
- Item 1446: Rev. of Sect. 4.0/4.1 & Rev.of Hdbk-ROUTINE REVISION (08/15/07)
- Item 1458: Basic JPA Overview Training - OPERATING COMMITTEE (02/20/08)
- Item 1462: Sect 7.12 OT Cost/Disaster Replmt - ROUTINE REVISION (04/08/08)
- Item 1471: Draft Final Process - ROUTINE REVISION (09/09/08)
- Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement - ROUTINE REVISION (09/17/08)
- Item 1475: 2010 Operating Budget - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1476: Lease Expiration - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1481: American Tower Mbrship App. - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1482: Non-Disclosure for Handbook - OPERATING COMMITTEE (1/21/09)
- Item 1483: Section 16.1-B Elimination - ROUTINE REVISION (01/21/09)
- Item 1485: Final Initiation Requirements - ROUTINE REVISION (01/21/09)
- Item 1486: Offsite Server BackUp/T1 Fees- OPERATING COMMITTEE (3/18/09)
- Item 1487: Review of Auth Costs – AUTHORIZED COSTS (04/14/09)
- Item 1488: Pole Class Field on Pole Record - ROUTINE REVISION (04/14/09)
- Item 1489: Assign Space Result of Rearrangement-ROUTINE REVISION (04/14/09)
- Item 1490: Disaster Contingency Plan - OPERATING COMMITTEE (4/15/09)

The members reviewed the items, and the consensus is to place **Item 1485: Final Initiation Requirements** with the revisions to Section 18.2 on the June Consent Calendar.

**Item 1485: *Environmental Issues***

This is a standing open item.

**New Business**

**Known Items:**

*No new known items.*

**Unknown Items:**

Wind-loading ad hoc committee

Ms. Hernandez stated that at the last ad hoc Routine Revision meeting, SCE presented a thorough and informative demonstration of their wind-loading program. It was noted that the committee should address wind loading in regards to criteria and other values since it is becoming more prevalent in the joint pole arena. Therefore, the consensus of the Routine ad hoc is to form another ad hoc committee to address wind loading. Ms. Hernandez inquired if any members would be interested in becoming a part of the ad hoc wind loading committee. The following members volunteered to join the ad hoc wind loading committee: AT&T Mobility, NextG, AT&T California, City of Anaheim, City of Banning, Verizon Wireless, Southern California Edison, Sprint-Nextel, Verizon California, and City of Los Angeles (DWP). The chairperson for this ad hoc committee is to be decided at the first meeting.

Router Form

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion on the router form. She reported that many members utilize contractors to process JPAs, and added that the SCJPC web site has a page reflecting member's mailing list of forms. Some members list their engaged contractors mailing address on the web site list, however some do not. She further added that many contractors attach a router to the JPA notating their phone number and address, to aide other members in returning the form to the proper parties. However, some members in some instances send paperwork to the member and not the contractor being engaged by the member to process said JPAs. To this Ms. Hernandez proposed placing a notation on the JPA Alert that reads, "If a routing form is attached to a JPA the mailing information on the router supersedes the mailing list information on the SCJPC web page". She inquired if the members are in agreement with this statement.

Mr. Chow stated that it appears that this should be included in the process, however, this would require his inquiring within his organization.

Ms. Hernandez stated that members are responding by mailing JPAs to the member's and not the contractor engaged by the member and who initiated the JPA. If there are changes necessary, the contractor might not become aware of them due to the delay in receiving the JPA back and move forward because the 45-day period

has elapsed. She added that historically, she did not experience this problem, however, as a contractor, she is experiencing this routing problem today.

She stated that the router form is also the tracer form. The heading on the form reads, "tracer/router". It can be used as a tracer and/or router. She added that this might prove confusing to some members. However, when using the form as a tracer, you are to check the appropriate box on the form, and likewise when the form is used as a router.

The aforementioned verbiage is not ready for the JPA alert at this time, because SCE has requested additional time to review this issue within his organization.

**Item 1491: Form 49 Review** has been assigned to the Routine Revision ad hoc committee for further discussion.

#### PG&E Membership Inquiry

Mr. Chow reported that SCE has been working with PG&E on joint pole issues since PG&E left the committee. Currently, they handle transactions via a lease agreement. PG&E has requested SCE to inquire into the process of becoming a member of the SCJPC once again. Mr. Chow stated that he responded, from his recollection, that at one time there was a window where the committee members allowed those members who formerly were members to return and their time would be bridged. However, that opportunity has expired. He questioned if he was correct in his recollections and statement. The members responded that he was correct, and if PG&E desired to return to the SCJPC this would require applying for membership and following through the application process.

#### NextG questionable instances

Ms. Haney inquired direction from the members in regards to an instance where NextG had issued an intent JPA, the 45-days had elapsed so NG moved forward with their built. Later an owner responded that some of the poles in question were failing wind loading. Ms. Hernandez inquired if NG's wind loading calculations did not fail. Ms. Haney responded that their calculations did not fail. She added the other member in this instance is Edison. She reported that the final has not been issued, and she is asking if in this instance should NG final the JPA with the original intent and then follow up with a new Form 2 with intent to replace the failed poles.

Ms. Hernandez responded in the affirmative; because NG must pay for the pole they are attached to, and pay for the pulling of the old pole. These transactions would not occur on the replacement Form. She added that this instance would require communication between SCE and NG in how they would handle this transaction.

Mr. Chow responded that he agrees with Ms. Hernandez in that this would maintain sequential order.

Ms. Haney presented a second instance where NG issued JPAs, and due to internal miscommunication some of the JPAs were built prior to approval and now it appears that NG is attached unauthorized per Section 4.1. She added that NG has been notified that they are 4.1 and some poles have failed. Her question is should NG final as 4.1 and then proceeds with a new Form 2 for the pole replacement? Or, should NG revise the JPAs and notate the pole replacements on the original Form 2? Mr. Chow responded that this would be handled in the similar method as the previous situation. Ms. Haney added that the miscommunication issue has been resolved within her organization.

Ms. Haney thanked the members for their responses and support. NG would now move forward with these Forms.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Basic JPA Tr/Orientation	To	Be	announced
Routine Revision	06/09/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Computer Committee	06/09/09	Following	Routine Revision
Authorized Costs	06/09/09	Following	Computer Committee
Reorganization	06/09/09	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	06/17/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	06/17/09	Following	Administrative Board
Wind Loading	06/17/09	Following	Operating Committee

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Mr. Chow adjourned the meeting at 12.15 p.m., until June 17, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mr. Larry Chow, President.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operations

**ADAMS, HAWKOTTE & HUDSON**

A PARTNERSHIP INCLUDING A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

201 SOUTH LAKE AVENUE  
SUITE 606

PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91101-9081

TELEPHONE (626) 593-8000

FACSIMILE (626) 577-9400

\* A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION,  
† ALSO A LICENSED S.F.A. IN CALIFORNIA

April 13, 2009

Southern California Joint Pole Committee  
437 S. Cataract Ave., Suite 3  
San Dimas, CA 91773

Attention: Jennie Corella  
Manager of Operations

RECEIVED  
M APR 14 2009

Re: Non-Disclosure Statement

Dear Ms. Corella:

I am writing in response to your letter of April 9, 2009, in which you asked whether it would be prudent to allow a prospective new member to view the SCJPC 1998 Agreement ("Agreement"), and the current Routine Handbook, prior to application for membership.

I believe it would be prudent to allow prospective new members to view these documents. First, with respect to the Agreement, a new member will be required to sign it, so the prospective new member should be allowed to view the agreement which it will be required to sign. It would be imprudent on the part of the prospective new member to not see and review the agreement prior to applying for membership, in order to know exactly just what the new member is applying for.

Similarly, I do not see a problem in disclosing the Routine Handbook to a prospective new member. I note your statement that the handbook reflects over 100 years of work to document agreed upon guidelines and rules; however, I do not see what detriment there would be to the Pole Committee if an outsider became aware of these guidelines and rules. Would the outsider realize any business advantage by becoming aware of these guidelines and rules? I fail to see what that business advantage might be, however, if you can conceive of such an advantage, please let me know, and if it turned out that the outside organization could gain some sort of advantage, then I would suggest that you have the interested parties sign a non-disclosure agreement.

Attachment

Southern California Joint Pole Committee  
April 13, 2009  
Page two

I hope this answers your question. If you need anything else, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Roger Adams".

Roger Adams

## Southern California Joint Pole Committee

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

June 17, 2009

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. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Mr. Cory Autrey	Sprint-Nextel/Sprint Communications
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Mr. Rich Rolita	CA Clec LLC (teleconference)
Mr. Varghese George	City of Glendale
Ms. Annetta Baker	City of Colton (teleconference)
Mr. Dan Kjar	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles - DWP
Mr. Gary Hironimus	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Mr. Mahendra Garg	City of Anaheim
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena (teleconference)
Mr. Randall Starkey	Time-Warner (teleconference)
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc
Mr. Mark Denning	M-Power/Telepacific (teleconference)
Ms. Patti Ringo	Extenet Systems (teleconference)
Ms. Bridget Courtney	Golden State Water (teleconference)
Ms. Maryam Farajzadeh	City of Vernon (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Don Beckermann	MCI Communications/MCI Metro
Mr. Steve Rodriguez	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Michael Glassey	AT&T Comm/Local Services
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Mobility
Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Daniel Lippert	City of Burbank
Mr. Ihab Ibrahim	City of Banning
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Committee president Ms. Goetz called the meeting to order at 9:15 am and allowed for introductions. The roll was taken from the member roster to ensure that all attending and WebEx teleconferencing members are accounted for. It was noted that there are two members lacking representation. They are Verizon California, and NewPath Networks.

**HOUSEKEEPING:**

Ms. Goetz requested all lunch choices to be submitted in order to place the order in the required time necessary.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Ms. Goetz asked the members to review the May 20, 2009 Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. There were no revisions to the minutes. Mr. Autrey motioned to accept the minutes as written; Mr. Garg seconded the motion. After the votes were recorded by Ms. Goetz, the motion passed unanimously.

**MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the May 2009 budget expenses are \$42,584.52. She added that the month of May again reflects an average month. The members were fully assessed this amount.

**COMMUNICATIONS:**

*Item 1481: American Tower Membership*

Ms. Corella reported that she received a telephone call from the member applicant requesting a copy of the committee W-9 form. Upon receipt of the form, the applicant would send their application fee to commence the application process.

*Routine Handbook Subpoena*

Ms. Corella reported that she received a subpoena for the Routine Handbook. She reported that the plaintiff is Rodriguez et al, and the defendant is Southern California Edison. The subpoena references legal counsel for the City of Malibu.

After a brief discussion on the issue, the consensus is to contact committee legal for direction on replying to this subpoena.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

There were no special reports.

## **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

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

Mr. Walls reported that the authorized costs elements ad hoc committee met on June 9, 2009. He stated that the ad hoc would be reviewing all costs by batching the costs, and not move onto the next batch until the prior batch costs is agreeable with the members. The first batch would include items 1 through 19. He further reported that the ad hoc would start addressing the 2010 pole costs. There are some minor revisions to the pole price matrix. The matrix would be going out to the members for completion and submitting of their costs by no later than September 1, 2009. He recommended members read the minutes posted on the SCJPC web site for any further details.

### **Operating Committee**

Mr. Autrey reported that the operating committee met on May 20, 2009. He reported that the ad hoc has made a final decision on the company for the off-site server backup. The information is on the current agenda as communication to be shared with the members.

Discussed was the lease expiration, and lease options. An offer has been posed to a location in Upland. The counter from the Upland location would be discussed at the next meeting.

The non-disclosure agreement for the Routine Handbook continues to be discussed.

The last major issue for discussion was the salary action for the JPC office staff, which is nearly completed.

Mr. Autrey commented should any members have an interest in any of the items in Operating, to plan on attending the meeting scheduled

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

Mr. Wolfe reported that the ad hoc met on June 9, 2009. He reported that the ad hoc members have forwarded Section 11 to their respective legal departments for review. He added that the ad hoc would be reviewing section 10. Mr. Wolfe stated that he would extensively review section 10 and report his thoughts and interpretation to the members at the next meeting.

### **Routine Revision Committee**

Ms. Hernandez reported that the ad hoc met on June 9, 2009. She reported that a major topic of discussion was non-compliance with the Routine Handbook and unauthorized attachments. The ad hoc agrees that this violation exists in the field, however, would like to determine to what degree are members experiencing unauthorized attachment violations. Therefore, Ms. Hernandez inquired if the members could report to the ad hoc the degree of violation and the impact, if any, on their organization. The objective is to arrive at a method to deter unauthorized attachment. The ad hoc has extensively discussed methods to discourage this type behavior. She added that one proposal is to implement a tiered Section 4.1. She again solicited the members aid in addressing this issue, and added if there is anything they would like to share with the ad hoc to notify Ms. Corella who would then forward the information to the Routine Revision ad hoc committee.

She added that the members discussed the 2-foot SCZ for wireless, and the consensus among the ad hoc members is that since only wireless are allowed to attach within the SCZ, they have the option to purchase it if they need it, or not purchase if there is no need for the space.

The members also discussed the additional space resulting from a new member rearranging facilities creating additional space. The suggestion is that the incoming member should purchase any additional space resulting from the rearrangement. The ad hoc is to review section 10 for additional verbiage and revision to address this issue at their next meeting.

Ms. Hernandez concluded by encouraging members to review the minutes posted on the SCJPC.net web page.

### **Computer Communications ad hoc Committee**

Ms. Goetz reported that Computer Communications did not meet this month.

### **Basic JPA Orientation and Training ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Lippert reported that Basic JPA Orientation and Training ad hoc committee did not meet this month.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

**Item 1485: Final Initiation Requirement – Revision to Section 18.2.**

Ms. Hernandez opened by stating that members are urged to final their JPAs, however, there is no reference in the Routine Handbook to a time line for finalization. Therefore, the Routine ad hoc committee is proposing a 90-day time frame (see attachment I). Ms. Hernandez inquired if any members have any concerns or issues. She then motioned to accept the proposed revisions to section 18.2. Ms. Prescott seconded the motion. After Ms. Goetz obtained votes from all members, the motion passed unanimously. It was agreed that this revision would be on the JPA Alert, and effective July 1, 2009.

**DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

**Item 1486: Offsite Server Backup** - *Operating committee recommends engaging Velocity Network as a 100GB offsite server backup provider. The cost 299.00 per month to be assessed equally for the remainder of 2009, and a one time set up cost of \$1,195.00 to be assessed equally. This is a 36-month contract, and starting 2010 the monthly cost would be budgeted for that year, and assessed proportionately.*

Mr. Autrey reported that the operating committee held a conference call with Velocity Network where they presented their method of offsite backup. He added that the purpose of placing this item on the agenda is that since this expense was not previously budgeted, the expense would be shared equally for the remainder of this year. The expense would be accounted for on the incoming years budget, and shared proportionately. The operating committee is notifying the members of this new monthly expense to be shared equally in that members might prepare for this additional cost.

**Item 1488: Pole Class Field on Pole Record**

Ms. Hernandez opened by stating that the Routine ad hoc committee is of the opinion that it would be prudent to list the pole class on JPAS to be recorded on pole records. She added that the ad hoc has revised the Form 2 to reflect this information. However, she added that the ad hoc is aware that there are many members who have their specific JPAs formatted on their software. In this situation, the pole class info may be placed on a specific area on the JPA, providing the JPC office is notified and aware of where to locate pole class information from specific JPAs. If approved, this additional information required on JPAs must be noted or the JPA would be returned. The ad hoc would be working on revisions to section 18.

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS 03/14/07)
- Item 1440: Review of 1998 Agreement - RE-ORGANIZATION (05/18/07)
- Item 1446: Rev. of Sect. 4.0/4.1 & Rev.of Hdbk-ROUTINE REVISION (08/15/07)
- Item 1458: Basic JPA Overview Training - OPERATING COMMITTEE (02/20/08)
- Item 1462: Sect 7.12 OT Cost/Disaster Replmt - ROUTINE REVISION (04/08/08)
- Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement - ROUTINE REVISION (09/17/08)
- Item 1475: 2010 Operating Budget - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1476: Lease Expiration - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1481: American Tower Mbrship App. - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1482: Non-Disclosure for Handbook - OPERATING COMMITTEE (1/21/09)
- Item 1485: Final Initiation Requirements - ROUTINE REVISION (01/21/09)
- Item 1486: Offsite Server BackUp/T1 Fees- OPERATING COMMITTEE (3/18/09)
- Item 1487: Review of Auth Costs – AUTHORIZED COSTS (04/14/09)
- Item 1488: Pole Class Field on Pole Record - ROUTINE REVISION (04/14/09)
- Item 1489: Assign Space Result of Rearrangement-ROUTINE REVISION (04/14/09)
- Item 1490: Disaster Contingency Plan - OPERATING COMMITTEE (4/15/09)
- Item 1491: Form 49 Review - ROUTINE REVISION (05/20/09)
- Item 1492: 2010 Pole Prices - AUTHORIZED COSTS (06/09/09)

**Item 1485: *Environmental Issues***

This is a standing open item.

**New Business**

***Known Items:***

***Item 1491: Form 49 Review – Revisions to Sections 18.0 and 18.8.***

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion by stating that the existing Form 49 is a tracer and also a multi-party routing form. However, the description of the Form 49 in the Routine Handbook does not notate router, but the form itself notes tracer/router as the title. She added that the revision to the handbook is the description of the Form 49 title, which now reads, “Tracer and Multiparty Router”. She further stated that many members today engage contractors to handle their JPA volume of work, and some members engage multiple contractors. Attaching the

router to a JPA alerts the receiving party(s) to whom the JPA should be returned to by notating on the router a name, address and telephone number. Ms. Hernandez added that her organization has been utilizing the routing form for all JPAs they have initiated stating return address, telephone number and to whom the specific JPA should be returned. Some members have disregarded her router forms and refer to the SCJPC web site membership information page and at times return the JPA to the member representative. This practice caused a delay in returning the JPAs and has an impact on the 45-day time clock. Therefore, Ms. Hernandez is proposing that if a router is attached to the JPA with contact information, that the routers supercede the membership information mailing list. She questioned if the members have a concern with this proposal.

Ms. Goetz responded that this would be an issue within her organization and the method in which they sort their return JPA mail. In that SCE processes over 1000 pieces of mail daily they gain mail information from the SCJPC web page. It would prove labor intensive if SCE has to pull out those JPAs that have a router attached and require special handling.

Mr. Autrey stated that contractors have been processing member JPAs historically for a very long time. He inquired as to why at this time, has this become an issue? Ms. Hernandez agreed and stated that she too is questioning how this is now an issue and concern. She reiterated that she is proposing to implement that if a router is attached to a JPA, the contact information on the router supersedes all other mailing information. She added that routers should not be removed.

Ms. Haney commented that NextG has received special requests from other members. She added that NextG in the spirit of the committee has always honored fellow member requests, and does not discriminate among members. All member requests are treated equally.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that the mailing address on the web site mailing list for T-Mobile is current, however, his mail is being sent to the previous address, which could be that SCE is referring to an older mailing list, and not the current list on the web site.

Ms. Goetz responded that this is the first she has heard of the mailing issue with T-Mobile. She requested members contact her in that she has the ability to resolve the problem.

Ms. Hernandez stated that she understands the challenge facing SCE due to their large volume; however, she requested that SCE research their internal mailing process to aid in resolution of this problem for those members engaging contractors to process their work.

The members discussed this issue extensively and the consensus is to return this item to the Routine Revision ad hoc committee for further discussion.

***Unknown Items:***

***Representative Pictures on SCJPC web site – City of Anaheim***

Mr. Garg stated that he proposed placing a picture of the current member representative along side their name list on the SCJPC.net site, in order to identify fellow members.

Mr. Autrey stated that this issue was discussed at the last operating committee meeting, and he felt Mr. Garg would like to address this issue to the board members.

Mr. Wolfe stated that the photo could be business casual and from the chest up so that the pictures appear uniform.

Ms. Goetz suggested that she take a tally to ascertain who would support this issue and determine if the committee should pursue it. When the tally was complete the result is not to place representative photos on the web site.

***Form 48 – additional operation number 22 added***

Mr. Walls reported that at the last Routine Revision ad hoc meeting, the Form 48 was revised by adding operation number 22 entitled, “Add item for hand-dig, specify nature of conflict”. He added that members could notate the nature of conflict (i.e. gas line).

***Antenna attachment restrictions – City of Glendale***

Mr. George reported that the City of Glendale is experiencing an issue with wireless attaching antennas on their poles. He added that Glendale would no longer allow wireless members to attach antennas. He questioned if there is anything in the agreement that mandates members must sell space to other members.

Ms. Hernandez responded that the agreement states that no member is required to sell space to fellow members. However, there are other regulations such as the telecom act that states no restraint of trade. She added that Glendale should research into the telecom act to determine any acts of violation on their part.

Mr. Autrey added that the city attorney would be investigating this issue on behalf of Glendale in that previously Glendale allowed antennas, and has now decided to restrict them.

Therefore, the committee has no jurisdiction mandating members to sell space to other members, but Mr. George was advised to research into other legal restrictions pertaining to prohibiting pole space to other entities.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Basic JPA Tr/Orientation	07/07/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Routine Revision	07/14/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Computer Committee	07/14/09	Following	Routine Revision
Authorized Costs	07/14/09	Following	Computer Committee
Reorganization	07/14/09	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	07/15/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	07/15/09	Following	Administrative Board
Wind Loading	07/29/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Goetz adjourned the meeting at 11.15 a.m., until July 15, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Sherri Goetz, President.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operations

## Attachment I

### Item 1485: Final Initiation Requirement

#### Current

##### **18.2 Form 2 Final – Initiation**

The Member initiating transaction shall transmit one copy of this form, which shall be an original Southern California Joint Pole Committee authorized typed or electronic document, to Joint Pole Committee, specifying work as completed under approved Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization not less than 45 calendar days after sending the completed Form 48. If all parties to the Joint Pole Authorization have approved the preliminary as written, the 45 calendar days may be waived. All data essential to complete the record must be specified, including Member accounting data, voltage and space shown on Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization.

**NOTE:** If the above information cannot be obtained by the issuing Member, the Committee office is authorized to obtain said information from the non-issuing Member. Transfer, Installation, equipment, and other authorized costs must be shown by item number and number of items.

##### **Proposed:**

##### **18.2 Form 2 Final – Initiation**

The Member initiating transaction shall transmit one copy of this form, which shall be an original Southern California Joint Pole Committee authorized typed or electronic document, to Joint Pole Committee, specifying work as completed under approved Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization not less than 45 and **no more than 90** calendar days after sending the completed Form 48. **After 90 days 18.1F may apply.** If all parties to the Joint Pole Authorization have approved the preliminary as written, the 45 calendar days may be waived.

All data essential to complete the record must be specified, including Member accounting data, voltage and space shown on Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization.

**NOTE:** If the above information cannot be obtained by the issuing Member, the Committee office is authorized to obtain said information from the non-issuing Member. Transfer, Installation, equipment, and other authorized costs must be shown by item number and number of items. The date sent on the Form 2 Final will always be the same as the date sent on the Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization.

## Southern California Joint Pole Committee

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

July 15, 2009

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. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Mr. Cory Autrey	Sprint-Nextel/Sprint Communications
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Mr. Rich Rolita	CA Clec LLC (teleconference)
Ms. Charito De Castro	City of Glendale
Ms. Annetta Baker	City of Colton (teleconference)
Mr. Dan Kjar	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles - DWP
Mr. Gary Hironimus	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Mr. Joe Orona	City of Anaheim
Mr. Mark Kelso	NewPath Networks (teleconference)
Mr. Rex Myers	City of Colton (teleconference)
Mr. Randall Starkey	Time-Warner (teleconference)
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc (teleconference)
Mr. Mark Denning	M-Power/Telepacific (teleconference)
Ms. Bridget Courtney	Golden State Water (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Justin Cashmer	Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Don Beckermann	MCI Comm/MCI Metro (teleconference)
Mr. Steve Rodriguez	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Michael Glassey	AT&T Comm/Local Serv. (teleconference)
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Mr. Daniel Lippert	City of Burbank
Mr. Ihab Ibrahim	City of Banning
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Committee president Mr. Chow called the meeting to order at 9:05 am and allowed for introductions from those members in attendance and teleconferencing. The roll was taken to ensure that all in attendance are accounted for.

**HOUSEKEEPING:**

Mr. Chow informed the attendees where the restrooms are located in the office, and asked those members who intend to remain for the next meeting to submit their choices for lunch.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Mr. Chow asked the members to review the June 17, 2009 Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. There were no revisions to the minutes. Mr. Rodriguez motioned to accept the minutes as written; Ms. Hernandez seconded the motion. After the votes were tallied, the motion passed unanimously.

**MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the June 2009 budget expenses are \$44, 302.17. She added that the month of June again reflects an average month. The members were fully assessed this amount.

**COMMUNICATIONS:**

*Item 1481: American Tower Membership*

Ms. Corella reported that she received the requested documents from the applicant and their non-refundable application fee of \$725.00. She further reported that their Form 10-K is a lengthy document, and contains their financials and other relevant information. The document is available on the SCJPC website under Administrative Board packet July 15, 2009.

Ms. Corella stated that the Form 10-K is a report on American Tower Corporation, but the application is in the name of ATC Outdoor DAS, LLC. She added that this is similar to the application submitted by current member, CA-CLEC, LLC. The parent company is applying for the subsidiary. The CPCN has been issued in the name of the subsidiary.

The members are to take the documents submitted by the applicant and determine if the application process should continue to move forward. If the

applicant's financial status is satisfactory, the application would move on to the next step in the process.

### **SPECIAL REPORTS**

There were no special reports.

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

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

Mr. Hunter reported that the authorized costs ad hoc committee did not meet.

#### **Operating Committee**

Mr. Autrey reported that the operating committee met on June 17, 2009. He further reported that the committee reviewed the monthly standard items. One key issue on the table is the lease expiration of the current JPC office, and procuring another location, or negotiating and renewing the current lease. Another issue is a non-disclosure agreement for those members who are considering membership, but prior to deciding would like to review the Routine Handbook. The committee would contact the SCJPC legal for direction. Lastly, he reported that he has completed and discussed with Ms. Corella her performance evaluation and would be meeting with her to discuss her goals and objectives.

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

Mr. Wolfe reported that the ad hoc met on July 14, 2009, and is currently reviewing section 11 of the 1998 Agreement. This is to determine if the agreement is in line with how business is transacted today. The members have taken this section to their respective legal offices for their review and interpretation. He further reported that the members discussed section 10 – Breaches and Defaults in the agreement. He asked members to refer to the minutes of the meeting for further details.

### **Routine Revision Committee**

Ms. Hernandez reported that the ad hoc met on July 14, 2009. She reported that at the next ad hoc meeting, the committee would exclusively discuss unauthorized attachments, and section 4.0 and the remainder of the section. She stated that at the last meeting she asked if any members have an issue with unauthorized attachment to email Ms. Corella their issues. Ms. Corella stated that she has not received any messages relating to unauthorized attachment. Ms. Hernandez encouraged members to attend the next meeting, in that unauthorized attachment is a much-discussed topic. She further reported that the pole class information on the JPA would be a requirement effective January 2010, but members should begin this process now in order to be prepared when it is required.

### **Computer Communications ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Chow reported that Computer Communications met July 14, 2009. The primary concern is to arrive at a testing protocol for the current version of the iPAM application. The consensus is that a selected few members would test the application for better control. There are questions and concerns in regards to the software prior to moving forward with the testing. One concern is some members would like to test and get approval from their respective IT personnel prior to installing the software within their organizations. There is also the issue of data that would be used in the testing. Would the database be a complete or partial database? There is a time schedule needed for Hyperlink to visit the test sites and install the software. Mr. Chow encouraged the members to read the minutes when they become available on the SCJPC.net web site.

### **Basic JPA Orientation and Training ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Lippert reported that Basic JPA Orientation and Training ad hoc committee met on July 9, 2009. He reported that it was agreed to use one JPA through out the presentation to reflect section examples. This should simplify in understanding the process as you view the training module. He reported that the latest version of the training module is available on the SCJPC.net web site.

### **Pole Loading ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Wolfe reported that the initial meeting transpired on June 17, 2009. He was nominated as chairperson for the ad hoc meeting. The members discussed the basic framework, the intention and the objectives of the ad hoc committee. The members have been given a copy of the pole-loading two-year project draft created by the NCJPA for their individual review. The NCJPA has no problem in sharing

this document with the SCJPC. The ad hoc is to review the project that the NCJPA has created in future meetings.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

There were no items for consent.

**DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

There were no items for discussion.

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS 03/14/07)
- Item 1440: Review of 1998 Agreement - RE-ORGANIZATION (05/18/07)
- Item 1446: Rev. of Sect. 4.0/4.1 & Rev.of Hdbk-ROUTINE REVISION (08/15/07)
- Item 1458: Basic JPA Overview Training - OPERATING COMMITTEE (02/20/08)
- Item 1462: Sect 7.12 OT Cost/Disaster Replmt - ROUTINE REVISION (04/08/08)
- Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement - ROUTINE REVISION (09/17/08)
- Item 1475: 2010 Operating Budget - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1476: Lease Expiration - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1481: American Tower Mbrship App. - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1482: Non-Disclosure for Handbook - OPERATING COMMITTEE (1/21/09)
- Item 1483: Section 16.1-B Revision - ROUTINE REVISION (01/21/09)
- Item 1487: Review of Auth Costs – AUTHORIZED COSTS (04/14/09)
- Item 1488: Pole Class Field on Pole Record - ROUTINE REVISION (04/14/09)
- Item1489: Assign Space Result of Rearrangement-ROUTINE REVISION (04/14/09)
- Item 1490: Disaster Contingency Plan - OPERATING COMMITTEE (4/15/09)
- Item 1491: Form 49 Reformat - ROUTINE REVISION (05/20/09)
- Item 1492: 2010 Pole Prices - AUTHORIZED COSTS (06/09/09)
- Item 1493: Evaluate Pole Load Programs – POLE-LOADING (06/17/09)

Ms. Hernandez remarked that item 1491 has been changed to read “Form 49 Reformat”. She added that this form is outdated and requires review and revision.

Ms. Wolfe inquired if item 1489 is still open. Ms. Hernandez responded that the ad hoc would be reviewing section 10 in regards to this issue.

**Item 1485: *Environmental Issues***

This is a standing open item.

**New Business**

***Known Items:***

There were no known items.

***Unknown Items:***

**2-Step Process for non-compliance**

Ms. Hernandez reported that the Routine Revision ad hoc committee has been working on and has created a step process to address non-compliance of the 1998 Agreement and the Routine Handbook. The consensus is the following 2-step process. Step one is when a member who is non-compliant to the Routine Handbook and/or the 1998 Agreement, adversely affects another member. The affected member should attempt to resolve the issue with the offending member. If there is no resolution, step two is to bring the issue to the Administrative Board for discussion, and possible resolution. There are no further steps, because the objective is to resolve the issue by the second step.

Ms. Hernandez stated that historically, she has experienced instances when an issue is brought before the Board, discussed and resolved. In many instances an extensive discussion results in resolution. She added that many times, a member is not aware that they are non-compliant and then this becomes a training issue.

Mr. Chow added that it has been discovered in some instances, that a members does not fully understand the process. Again, this becomes a training issue; therefore, the ad hoc is in hope that a third step is not required. Since the third step could entail mediation, and punitive action.

Mr. Riota suggested tracking member's actions of non-compliance to determine a pattern.

Ms. Hernandez responded that in the past, she as chair of the ad hoc Routine Revision committee has solicited member's to provide her with any issues of non-compliance, or members that are not adhering to the Handbook. She added that she has not received any communication to her solicitation. This item number has been an open item on the Routine agenda for a great length of time. She further added that if the ad hoc had some issues to aid them, perhaps they could have

created more steps to the process. As it stands, the ad hoc is of the opinion that this two-step process should address all issues, and it is a start to resolution.

Mr. Rodriguez suggested creating a page on the SCJPC.net web site where members might post their issues of non-compliance. This would create a tracking method, and the committee could review periodically.

Mr. Wolfe stated that he agrees with Mr. Rodriguez in tracking the issues of non-compliance, and how and if they were resolved. This could aid members with step one.

The consensus is to return this issue to the ad hoc committee to discuss creating a page on the SCJPC.net web page where members could post their issues of non-compliance that were not resolved between members.

### **Item 1488:Pole Class Field on Pole Record**

Ms. Hernandez reported that the Routine ad hoc committee has arrived at a decision of where to place the pole class information on the Form 2. The information should be easily traceable in that the JPC office could read and update the pole records. The consensus is that the information would be under the pole treatment class and anchor direction column. The class info would be in the same box as the pole treatment, or directly under.

Mr. Wolfe stated that some composite poles specify a class. Ms. Hernandez inquired as to how the JPC office is to determine which CF poles require classification, and which do not. The staff would not know which JPAs to return for pole class information.

Mr. Wolfe stated that in CF poles, if a class were specified, then the class would be noted on the JPA. If there is no classification on the JPA, than a class is not required.

Ms. Hernandez stated that consistency is required so the JPC staff is aware at which specific location the class is listed.

The consensus is to place this item number on the Consent Calendar of the next Board meeting.

### **Wireless Safety Clearance Zone**

Ms. Hernandez reported that with the new rule 94, the antenna owner is allowed to attach within the 2-foot RF safety clearance zone (SCZ). The Routine ad hoc committee has added verbiage to Section 3.15 (see attachment). She added that the antenna owner has the option to purchase one or two feet if needed, or opt not to purchase.

Ms. Hernandez reported that Section 4.3 has been revised, since there is reference to it in the newly revised Section 3.15 (see attachment). The section has been split with A and B sub-sections to differentiate between electrical and RF. The

ad hoc committee intends on doing a word search in the Routine Handbook for safety clearance zone, and insert electrical or RF where necessary.

In closing Ms. Hernandez stated that this is information for the Board, and these revisions are not ready for the consent calendar. If there are any concerns with the revisions, please contact the Routine Revision ad hoc committee chair, Ms. Hernandez.

**Fruit Fly Project**

Mr. Chow reported that SCE has been notified by the State of California Department of Food and Agriculture that there is project in the City of Garden Grove in regards to fruit flies. They have been notified that they would not be treating utility wood poles. The pest is the Guava fruit fly. He added if any members would like more information on this project, they might contact him.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Basic JPA Tr/Orientation	08/06/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Routine Revision	08/11/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Computer Committee	08/11/09	Following	Routine Revision
Authorized Costs	08/11/09	Following	Computer Committee
Reorganization	08/11/09	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	08/19/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	08/19/09	Following	Administrative Board
Pole Loading	08/26/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Mr. Chow adjourned the meeting at 10:15 a.m., until August 19, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mr. Larry Chow, President.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operations

Attachment

**Revisions in RED**

**3.15 Notice of Intention to Place Wireless Antenna**

**(For space allocation, this section must be shown on the Final JPA)**

Members proposing the installation of antennas shall prepare and submit to all owners on record, a Preliminary JPA (Form 2-1) notifying the members of their intention to construct. (See example 11 in Section 18).

Note: General Order 95, Rule 94 requires an additional 2' RF Safety Clearance Zone. Refer to Section 16.1, Chart 16.1B. **Owner of the antenna may purchase 1' or 2' of the RF Safety Clearance Zone. See section 4.3.**

**4.3 Purchase of Interest in Safety Clearance Zone**

**A. Purchase or sale of the right to use space within the Electrical Safety Clearance Zone:**

Any Member planning to construct on a jointly owned pole where space is limited and all owners approve may purchase into the Electrical Safety Clearance Zone in accordance with General Order 95. The purchase or sale of the right to use this space shall be initiated on a Joint Pole Authorization and construction shall begin within the time limits prescribed in Section 18.1D. The constructing Member may purchase in one-foot increments to a maximum of two feet and must attach at the grade requested (see Section 16.0). Guard arms must be installed by the purchasing Member in the manner prescribed by General Order 95.

**B. Purchase of the right to use space within the RF Safety Clearance Zone:**

The antenna owner may construct into the RF Safety Clearance Zone in accordance with General Order 95, Rule 94. The purchase of the right to use this space shall be initiated on a Joint Pole Authorization and construction shall begin within the time limits prescribed in Section 18.1D. The constructing Member may purchase in one-foot increments to a maximum of two feet (see Section 16.0).

Note: General Order 95, Rule 94 requires an additional 2' RF Safety Clearance Zone. Refer to Section 16.1, Chart 16.1B.

## Southern California Joint Pole Committee

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

September 16, 2009

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. Paula Haney	NextG Networks (teleconference)
Mr. Cory Autrey	Sprint-Nextel/Sprint Communications
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena (teleconference)
Ms. Janet Amuso	CA-CLEC
Ms. Maryam Farajzadeh	City of Vernon (teleconference)
Mr. Varghese George	City of Glendale
Ms. Rex Myers	City of Colton (teleconference)
Mr. Dan Kjar	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles (teleconference)
Mr. Rudy Villavicencio	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Mr. Mahendra Garg	City of Anaheim
Ms. Patti Ringo	ExTeNet Systems (teleconference)
Mr. Randall Starkey	Time-Warner (teleconference)
Mr. Jason Sears	NewPath Networks (teleconference)
Ms. Bridget Courtney	Golden State Water (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Justin Cashmer	Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Don Beckermann	MCI Comm/MCI Metro (teleconference)
Mr. Steve Rodriguez	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California
Mr. Michael Glassey	AT&T Comm/Local Serv.(teleconference)
Ms. Shawn Henderson	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Mr. Daniel Lippert	City of Burbank
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Mr. Kyle Levy	Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Committee president Mr. Chow called the meeting to order at 9:10 am. Mr. Chow then allowed Ms. Corella to take roll call. After roll was taken it was verified that two members are not in attendance, those members are City of Banning, and M-Power/TelePacific.

**HOUSEKEEPING:**

Mr. Chow requested that those members who are teleconferencing, not to place the meeting on hold in that it creates interference within the meeting. He added that those members who intend on remaining for lunch, complete their menu sheets, and submit them to Ms. Corella when completed.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Mr. Chow asked the members to review the August 19, 2009 Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. A typo was noted and would be corrected. Mr. Rodriguez motioned to accept the minutes as corrected. Mr. Garg seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the August 2009 budget expenses are \$47,625.78. She added that the month of August is reflecting an average month. The members were assessed 46,900.78 due to a credit from a non-refundable membership application fee.

**COMMUNICATIONS:**

*ATC Outdoor DAS*

Ms. Corella reported that she sent an email reminder to all members in regards to the submitted financial documents of the above-mentioned applicant. She would like a status from the members on their organizations view and/or status on the financial documents to determine if they are satisfactory to the committee. Ms. Corella quizzed each attending member with the following results:

- |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| 1. So. California Edison | Requesting additional time.  |
| 2. City of Burbank       | No comments.   |
| 3. City of Glendale      | No comments at this time.  |
| 4. Sprint/Nextel         | No concerns.   |
| 5. T-Mobile, USA         | Ongoing review – additional time.  |
| 6. NextG Networks        | Ongoing review – additional time.  |
| 7. Verizon Wireless      | No concerns.   |
| 8. City of Anaheim       | Requesting additional time.  |
| 9. AT&T Mobility         | Requesting additional time.  |
| 10. CA-CLEC LLC          | Requesting same process applied to applicant as required by CA-CLEC – Financial not accepted from parent company – must submit audited financial from subsidiary. CA-CLEC provided committee with parent company guarantee. Requesting that applicant follow the same application process required by CA-CLEC. |
| 11. AT&T California      | No issues or concerns. Approved membership NCJPA.  |
| 12. City of Pasadena     | No concerns.   |
| 13. XO Communications    | No concerns.   |
| 14. City of Vernon       | No concerns.   |
| 15. City of Los Angeles  | Requesting additional time.  |
| 16. Golden State Water   | Requesting additional time.  |
| 17. City of Riverside    | Requesting additional time.  |
| 18. AT&T Local Serv.     | Requesting additional time.  |
| 19. MCI Comm/Metro       | No concerns.   |
| 20. Verizon California   | No concerns.   |
| 21. Time Warner Cable    | No concerns.   |
| 22. City of Colton       | No concerns.   |
| 23. City of Azusa        | No concerns.   |

Mr. Autrey opened discussion on this issue in that member’s applications are assigned to the Operating committee. He inquired if the members that are requesting additional time could commit to have an answer to the satisfaction of the financial submitted by applicant. He added that as Ms. Amuso stated, this applicant who is applying as the subsidiary to a parent company should follow the process dictated to her organization during the application process.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that outlined in the new application process is that the entire process might take greater than six months from the time the application is submitted to review the financials and the application.

The members agree that the application process must be consistent, therefore, the consensus is that the applicant submit an audited financial for ATC Outdoor DAS, LLC to accompany the parent company financial documents. In that

the applicant's financial does not satisfy the committee then the applicant should prepare a parent company guarantee.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

There were no special reports.

## **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

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

Mr. Walls reported that the authorized costs ad hoc committee met the day before. Discussed at the meeting was overtime costs incurred by SCE for disaster situations. SCE is to further research the overtime costs for discussion at a future meeting. Members reviewed AC items 1-19 to identify items that necessitate further discussion. He suggested members review the minutes on the SCJPC.net web site for further details.

### **Operating Committee**

Mr. Autrey reported that the operating committee met on August 19, 2009. He reported that the members reviewed the standard agenda items. He further reported that a final counter proposal was submitted to the current office management for lease renewal and would be discussed at the next meeting. The ad hoc is starting a salary study project to ensure that the office staff salary is in line with today's compensation. He recommended the members to review the minutes for further details.

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

Mr. Wolfe reported that the ad hoc committee on Reorganization did not meet in September due to time constraints.

### **Routine Revision Committee**

Ms. Henderson reported that the Routine Revision ad hoc committee met the day prior and to review the minutes of that meeting when they are published on the SCJPC.net web site for details.

### **Computer Communications ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Chow reported that Computer Communications did not meet due to time constraints, and the need of the LA County permit requirements meeting.

### **Basic JPA Orientation and Training ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Lippert reported that the Basic JPA Orientation and Training ad hoc committee did not meet. He added that the Basic JPA Training Module is available on the SCJPC.net web site to all members.

Mr. Wolfe added that AT&T California staff have reviewed the training module available on the web, and he has received only positive feedback.

### **Pole Loading ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Walls reported that the Pole Loading committee met on August 26, 2009. The primary discussion was the maintenance of pole loading information. It was agreed that those members involved, and not the SCJPC office should maintain the pole loading information. The issue of exchanging and maintaining pole loading data would be discussed further at the next meeting.

Mr. Chow added that a result of the ad hoc meeting is to solicit from those members that maintain a pole loading program to submit a table listing and describing the type of facilities they attach to poles. He further added that the driver behind the need for this information is that it was determined that the discrepancy in calculations is that the members are using different numbers/data for the same type of equipment. When the tables are submitted to the ad hoc, the members would be reviewing the numbers/data to determine the range in difference.

Mr. Wolfe reported on the creation of an agenda for this ad hoc meeting. He added that it is currently difficult to create an agenda until the ad hoc is certain in which direction this ad hoc is moving. He added that as part of an outline or agenda, initially, he would address any negatives resulting from the meetings.

### **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

There were no items for consent.

**DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

*LA COUNTY PERMIT REQUIREMENTS*

Mr. Chow opened discussion by stating that the County attended last month's Board meeting and expressed some issues and concerns in regards to pole replacement and deteriorated poles. They shared what they expect from the membership in regards to acquiring permits for work related to pole replacements. He added that SCE has a process in place for their replacement program. He further stated that a result from the meeting is that all members also create a program related to pole replacement work within LA County and the permit requirement process.

Mr. Chow stated that the County is requesting a guaranteed process within the committee that would ensure there are no dual poles in the field. In the SCE process, when applying for a permit, SCE would notate all members on the pole and designate that member responsible for the PTD. Therefore, the County could expect the PTD member to apply for a permit within a short time of SCE acquiring their permit.

The members at the special meeting came to a consensus that as a default, the lowest attached hard facility member would be responsible for PTD.

In node pole applications where there is a wireless antenna, the default would be that wireless antenna member who would be identified as the PTD responsible party. Therefore, those PTD identified parties would be required to provide the County with their respective PTD process and the acquisition of the work permit.

The County has requested a follow-up meeting with the committee, therefore, it is expected that the County would be invited to the October Board meeting.

Mr. Wolfe reiterated that if you are the identified member to PTD a pole, be prepared to provide the County, if requested, your PTD program when acquiring your work permit.

In closing, Mr. Chow stated that if there is additional interest on this subject, please plan on attending the October Board meeting.

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS 03/14/07)
- Item 1440: Review of 1998 Agreement - RE-ORGANIZATION (05/18/07)
- Item 1446: Rev. of Sect. 4.0/4.1 & Rev.of Hdbk-ROUTINE REVISION (08/15/07)
- Item 1462: Sect 7.12 OT Cost/Disaster Replmt - ROUTINE REVISION (04/08/08)
- Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement - ROUTINE REVISION (09/17/08)
- Item 1475: 2010 Operating Budget - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1476: Lease Expiration - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)

Item 1481: American Tower Mbrship App. - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)  
Item 1482: Non-Disclosure for Handbook - OPERATING COMMITTEE (1/21/09)  
Item 1483: Section 16.1-B Revision - ROUTINE REVISION (01/21/09)  
Item 1487: Review of Auth Costs – AUTHORIZED COSTS (04/14/09)  
Item 1488: Pole Class Field on Pole Record - ROUTINE REVISION (04/14/09)  
Item 1489: Assign Space Result of Rearrangement-ROUTINE REVISION (04/14/09)  
Item 1490: Disaster Contingency Plan - OPERATING COMMITTEE (4/15/09)  
Item 1491: Form 49 Reformat - ROUTINE REVISION (05/20/09)  
Item 1492: 2010 Pole Prices - AUTHORIZED COSTS (06/09/09)  
Item 1493: Evaluate Pole Load Programs – POLE-LOADING (06/17/09)

There was no discussion on unfinished business items.

### **Item 1485: *Environmental Issues***

Mr. Wolfe reported, for the information to the members that some utility members in the NCJPA are about to enter into litigation due to utility poles leaking wood preservatives into the soil and water cables. He added that as an environmental issue he would like to remind members that there is EPA restrictions and state standards. He further added that he could not name the manufacturer primarily responsible, but it is a commonly used product.

### **New Business**

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

There were no known items.

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

##### **CPUC Pre-decision**

Mr. Alan Young stated that he would like to discuss the CPUC pre-decision phase one measures to reduce fire hazards and the issue of pole inspections. He inquired if the committee is addressing this issue, or are members handling the situation individually. He added that utilities are obligated to commence inspecting their poles prior to the incoming fire season.

Mr. Wolfe responded that all major California utilities are present at the OIR and are involved. He added that the inspection requirements would be released in phases and there is a pre-decision at this moment still being reviewed with possible editing.

Mr. Young stated that phase one was a final decision.

Mr. Wolfe responded that the CPSD returned last week and submitted another document for additional time. It is the same decision with corrections, editions and clarifications.

He added in phase one there are six high fire counties that have been identified in Southern California. AT&T California is currently developing patrolling standards and plans to retain information and exchange this information with other member utilities.

Mr. Young stated that it appears ineffective time management to have all members inspect the same pole(s).

Mr. Wolfe stated that phase one, patrolling is scheduled to be implemented September 30, 2010. He agrees that this is an issue that requires discussion within the committee, however, not necessarily be a part of the Routine.

Mr. Autrey stated that there are inspection-authorized costs, but it would be beneficial to all members if there were an equally shared cost for inspection.

Ms. Prescott stated that this issue of fire hazard is dependent on the individual utilities in that it is a liability concern. She added that she does not believe that any member would want the liable responsibility of other member's.

Discussed is the requirement of reporting any identified fire hazard dictated by the CPSD. Mr. Wolfe stated that what is required is, A) fire hazard situations must be reported, B) member reporting the situation should maintain a record of the report, C) the utility in fire hazard must maintain a record of addressing the situation, and D) the records should be available for rolling five-year periods.

It was agreed to further review visual inspection authorized costs within the ad hoc committee to determine what values are inclusive in the visual inspection.

Mr. Chow stated to review the visual piece that is related to the new requirement in the authorized cost, and perhaps add the patrol value. Members could agree who would handle the visual and share information and costs.

This topic of fire hazard would be discussed extensively at the Pole Loading and Authorized Costs ad hoc committees. This issue would remain on the forefront of the committee.

### **SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Routine Revision	10/13/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Computer Committee	10/13/09	Following	Routine Revision
Authorized Costs	10/13/09	Following	Computer Committee
Reorganization	10/13/09	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	10/21/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	10/21/09	Following	Administrative Board
Pole Loading	TO	BE	ANNOUNCED

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Mr. Chow adjourned the meeting at 10:35 p.m., until October 21, 2009.

---

Mr. Larry Chow, President.

---

Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operations

## Southern California Joint Pole Committee

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

October 21, 2009

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. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Mr. Cory Autrey	Sprint-Nextel/Sprint Communications
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena (teleconference)
Ms. Janet Amuso	CA-CLEC LLC
Ms. Maryam Farajzadeh	City of Vernon (teleconference)
Mr. Varghese George	City of Glendale
Ms. Annetta Baker	City of Colton (teleconference)
Mr. Dan Kjar	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Scott Hunter	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc (teleconference)
Mr. Rudy Villavicencio	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Mr. Mahendra Garg	City of Anaheim
Ms. Patti Ringo	ExTeNet Systems (teleconference)
Mr. Jason Sears	NewPath Networks (teleconference)
Mr. Randall Starkey	Time-Warner (teleconference)
Mr. Jason Sears	NewPath Networks (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Gary Clark	City of Banning
Mr. Justin Cashmer	Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Don Beckermann	MCI Comm/MCI Metro (teleconference)
Mr. Steve Rodriguez	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Comm/Local Serv
Ms. Shawn Henderson	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Mr. Daniel Lippert	City of Burbank (teleconference)
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Mr. Kyle Levy	Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Committee president Mr. Chow called the meeting to order at 9:05 am. Mr. Chow then allowed Ms. Corella to take roll call. After roll was taken it was verified that two members are not in attendance, those members are Golden State Water, and M-Power/TelePacific.

**HOUSEKEEPING:**

Mr. Chow requested that those members who are teleconferencing, not to place the meeting on hold in that it creates interference within the meeting. He added that those members who intend on remaining for lunch, complete their menu sheets, and submit them to Ms. Corella when completed.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Mr. Chow asked the members to review the September 16, 2009 Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. Mr. Wolfe stated that the minutes quote a discussion between himself and Mr. Young. He added that Mr. Young is not listed on the attendance rooster of the minutes. Ms. Corella responded that it is Mr. Alan Young of NextG Networks, and that she neglected to list his name on the attendance rooster, but would make the correction. Mr. Garg motioned to accept the minutes as corrected. Mr. Rodriguez seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the September 2009 budget expenses are \$51,251.58. She added that the month of September is reflecting an above-average month this is due to the annual audit payment to the committee accountant.

**COMMUNICATIONS:**

ATC Outdoor DAS

Ms. Corella reported that she contacted the applicant representative and notified him that the members continue to review the American Tower Corporation

financial documents. She further informed him that the committee would require an audited financial statement for the applicant (ATC Outdoor DAS). If the applicant could not provide an audited financial statement, then the committee might accept a guarantee from the parent company (American Tower Corporation).

Subpoena for pole records/handbook

Ms. Corella reported that she received a subpoena for pole records, JPAs and Routine Handbooks. The law firm requesting the documents is Thomas F. Mortimer Jr. located in Long Beach, California. The plaintiff is Judy Lopez et al, and the defendant is SCE, et al. She further reported that she responded to the subpoena and mailed the documents on CDs. The project was lengthy, but the response was within the required time frame.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that in the future, the committee officers should be made aware of any subpoenas to strategize a response and decide on further action.

Mr. Cashmer stated that he believes Verizon California is included in the legal action, and that the law firm has requested their records and mentioned that they would be requesting the documents from the SCJPC. He briefed the members to his knowledge of the lawsuit. He reported that Mr. Lopez, while employed by SCE developed cancer and expired. Therefore, this is a wrongful death case.

The consensus is that in the future, if any subpoenas or other legal requests are received at the JPC office, the manager would notify the current committee officers for direction.

**SPECIAL REPORTS**

There were no special reports.

**SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

**ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements**

Mr. Hunter reported that the authorized costs ad hoc committee met on October 13, 2009. Item 1462 and Item 1487 were tabled. In regards to 2010 pole prices, the remaining member who plans on submitting their pole costs is AT&T California. Mr. Wolfe responded that he would be submitting costs within one week. The final pole price draft would be complete when AT&T California costs are included.

### **Operating Committee**

Mr. Autrey reported that the operating committee met on September 16, 2009. The members reviewed the monthly standard items. The ad hoc discussed the 2010 operating budget, and plans on finalizing the draft for a possible November vote. The ad hoc is also reviewing the non-closure agreement for the Handbook prior to bringing it to the board for approval. The ad hoc is working on a salary study survey sheet to be sent to members to aid in arriving at compensation that reflects current compensation in the industry. Lastly, reported is the lease renewal, which is on the current agenda under known items. It is on the agenda in order that the Board authorizes Ms. Corella to sign the new lease agreement.

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

Mr. Wolfe reported that the ad hoc committee on Reorganization met in October. There is no further input on the Agreement, and the consensus is to table any further activity through the end of the year. The ad hoc would convene in January 2010.

### **Routine Revision Committee**

Ms. Henderson reported that the Routine Revision ad hoc committee met October 13, 2009 and discussed in depth Item 1446: Unauthorized Attachments. She added there are items for discussion on today's agenda. She suggested members review the minutes of that meeting for further details.

### **Computer Communications ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Chow reported that Computer Communications met on October 13, 2009. Primary topic is the testing of the iPAM software application. There are four member utilities that have volunteered to be a part of the testing team. There remain two test members that do not have IT issues, that require testing the accessibility to download software, and two members requesting a CD version to gain approval for the application from their IT department. The ad hoc would be creating JPA test scenarios beginning with the simple and moving on to the more complex. He then recommended that members review the minutes for further details.

### **Pole Loading ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Wolfe reported that the Pole Loading committee met on October 20, 2009. The members reviewed the latest NCJPA draft for section 6. There is another WebEx meeting scheduled for October 29, 2009. SCE requested AT&T California test the Osmose O-Calc software pole loading for communications, which he intends on performing prior to the next meeting. He concluded stating that members may review the minutes from this meeting when they become available on the SCJPC.net web site.

### **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

#### **Item 1476: Lease Expiration**

Moved to discussion.

#### **Item 1488: Pole Class Field on Pole Record**

Ms. Hernandez briefed the members on this new routine revision. She stated commencing January 2010, JPAs must notate the pole class on new pole sets. If purchasing onto an existing joint or solely owned pole if you have the class information, then notate it on the JPA. Pole class would not be noted on pole cards retroactively. She reiterated this is a moving forward JPA requirement.

Ms. Haney motioned to approve the consent calendar, and Ms. Hernandez seconded the motion. Mr. Corella recorded the votes on this item. The motion passed unanimously.

### **DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

#### **Item 1476: Lease Expiration**

Mr. Autrey reported the office lease would expire at the end of this month. After months of discussion and proposals, the operating ad hoc committee has agreed to renew the lease with conditions. The conditions are 1.10 PSF with a 3% escalation for seven years. The office would be re-painted, new carpet installed and the kitchen and bathroom would get new flooring. A new door and floor electrical outlets in the conference room is to be added. Mr. Autrey solicited a motion to authorize Ms. Corella to sign the lease. Ms. Haney motioned to authorize Ms.

Corella to sign the lease, and Mr. Rodriguez seconded the motion. After the vote roll was taken the motion passed unanimously.

**Item 1483: Section 16.1-B, 3.15, Antenna SCZ example JPA and associated diagram-revisions to sections-glossary.**

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion by stating that the Routine Revision ad hoc committee agreed that due to the GO 95 ruling regarding the two-foot antenna safety clearance zone (SCZ) there should be a distinction between electrical SCZ (6-foot or 4-foot with guard-arm) and antenna SCZ (2-foot). Therefore, the glossary definition for pole space (1) has been changed to D-1.A, and D-1.B to address both SCZ. A pole diagram and JPA example with related verbiage has been created for Section 18 to correlate with the antenna SCZ (see attachment).

She added that Section 16.2 has been revised in regards to the new antenna SCZ requirement (see attachment).

She further reported that verbiage has been added to Section 3.15 in the Note: section (see attachment). Section 4.3 has been revised to also differentiate between electrical and antenna SCZ (see attachment).

In summation, Ms. Hernandez stated that these changes were driven by the new CPUC in reference to antenna SCZ and would become effective and published January 1, 2010.

Mr. Autrey motioned to accept Item 1483 as discussed. Ms. Haney seconded the motion. Ms. Corella recorded the votes from members and the motion passed unanimously.

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS (03/14/07)
- Item 1440: Review of 1998 Agreement - RE-ORGANIZATION (05/18/07)
- Item 1446: Rev. of Sect. 4.0/4.1 & Rev.of Hdbk-ROUTINE REVISION (08/15/07)
- Item 1462: Sect 7.12 OT Cost/Disaster Replmt - ROUTINE REVISION (04/08/08)
- Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement - ROUTINE REVISION (09/17/08)
- Item 1475: 2010 Operating Budget - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1476: Lease Expiration - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1481: American Tower Mbrship App. - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1482: Non-Disclosure for Handbook - OPERATING COMMITTEE (1/21/09)
- Item 1483: Section 16.1-B Revision - ROUTINE REVISION (01/21/09)
- Item 1487: Review of Auth Costs – AUTHORIZED COSTS (04/14/09)
- Item 1488: Pole Class Field on Pole Record - ROUTINE REVISION (04/14/09)
- Item 1489: Assign Space Result of Rearrangement-ROUTINE REVISION (04/14/09)
- Item 1490: Disaster Contingency Plan - OPERATING COMMITTEE (4/15/09)
- Item 1491: Form 49 Reformat - ROUTINE REVISION (05/20/09)
- Item 1492: 2010 Pole Prices - AUTHORIZED COSTS (06/09/09)

- Item 1493: Evaluate Pole Load Programs – POLE-LOADING (06/17/09)
- Item 1494: PTD of Composite Poles - ROUTINE REVISION (09/15/09)
- Item 1495: Pole Inspections - ROUTINE REVISION (10/13/09)
- Item 1496: Inaccessible Pole Removal - ROUTINE REVISION (10/13/09)

There was no discussion on unfinished business items.

**Item 1485: *Environmental Issues***

No discussion on this item.

**New Business**

***Known Items:***

**Item 1489: Assignment of Space Resulting from Rearrangement-JPA Alert**

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion by stating that the JPC staff should not be questioning the final bill whether or not a member should be compensated for losing or gaining any space due to rearrangement. She added that once the JPA has been approved and final billed, the format that the JPA is in when it is received in the JPC office is the format it would be billed. She further added that a great deal of time is being utilized by the office in determining if a member should or should not be compensated. It is incumbent upon each individual member to ascertain if they are entitled to any compensation for space prior to approval of a JPA.

Ms. Baccus added that the final Form 2 must notate the correct section number.

Mr. Chow added that the onus is on the member utility to determine if they are to be compensated for the loss or acquisition of any additional space due to rearrangement. He added the goal is to expedite the JPA process when being final billed by the JPC staff.

This billing decision would become available on the JPA alert page of the SCJPC.net web page. This item is now closed.

**Create Nominating Committee of 2010 Officers**

Mr. Chow inquired if anyone would like to volunteer to chair the nominating committee. Ms. Haney responded that she would chair the committee. The following members volunteered to be on the committee: Verizon Wireless, AT&T

Local services, Sprint-Nextel, City of Anaheim, AT&T California, T-Mobile, and the City of Los Angeles.

### **LA County Permits Requirements**

Mr. Autrey inquired if the LA County Permits Requirements issue has been resolved. He added that to his recollection, the County would be returning to a Board meeting to hear the process the committee has implemented to resolve the issue of dual-poles in the field.

Mr. Chow responded that SCE and AT&T California are working together with the County on this issue. He added that to his knowledge, the County plans on returning some time in the future.

Mr. Wolfe reported that his organization is going to suggest the sharing of the permit cost and the activation of the permit, and that the default PTD party be identified on the permit application. They are also suggesting that the Form 48 trigger that owners on the pole to transfer their facilities within the established Routine guidelines, and that the PTD party would act within or near the specified time frame.

### **Unknown Items:**

#### **Member Codes that have merged.**

Ms. Baccus stated that member codes have merged and changed. She gave an example of Time Warner having the codes of MO and ABS. She added that when a record is pulled the code is updated and added if they could eliminate the non-recognized codes and replace them with current codes..

Mr. Chow stated that this decision would be up to that individual member. For legality purposes, they might wish to maintain the codes as they are and keep them separate.

Ms. Baccus stated that her objective is to clean the database eliminating codes that are no longer recognized as members.

Mr. Autrey responded that he would research into his organization in regards to Sprint-Nextel.

Mr. Starkey stated that he would also research Time-Warner and notify the JPC office if they could move forward with the changes.

#### **City of Banning – New Representative**

Ms. Corella reported that Mr. Chuck Thurman of the City of Banning reported that they have a new representative. That rep is Mr. Gary Clark.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Nominating Committee	10/26/09	9:00 a.m.	Teleconference
Routine Revision	11/10/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Computer Committee	11/10/09	Following	Routine Revision
Authorized Costs	11/10/09	Following	Computer Committee
Reorganization	Tabled	Until	January 2010
Pole Loading Committee	11/17/09	9:30 a.m.	Committee Office
Administrative Board	11/18/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	11/18/09	Following	Administrative Board
Pole Loading Committee	10/26/09	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Mr. Chow adjourned the meeting at 10:45 p.m., until November 18, 2009.

---

Mr. Larry Chow, President.

---

Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operations

## Attachment

### **D. Pole Space**

(1) A- Electrical Safety Clearance Zone: Jointly owned vertical pole space required by General Order 95, Rule 38, to safely separate facilities in alignment with Section 19.2 (January 2010) (1) B- Antenna Safety Clearance Zone: Jointly owned vertical pole space of two feet required by General Order 95, Rule 94 to safely separate facilities from an antenna. (See Section 16.1-B) (January 2010)

(2) Encroachable Safety Zone: Portion of the Safety Clearance Zone which may be purchased when allowed in accordance with General Order 95 after taking the appropriate safety precautions. (See Section 4.3, 19.2)

### **16.2 Space**

Space is measured downward from the highest grade purchased. **When safety clearance is not required all usable space will be allocated and priced accordingly.** (January 2010)

### **3.15 Notice of Intention to Place Wireless Antenna**

**(For space allocation, this section must be shown on the Final JPA)**

Members proposing the installation of antennas shall prepare and submit to all owners on record, a Preliminary JPA (Form 2-1) notifying the members of their intention to construct. (See example 11 in Section 18).

**Note:** General Order 95, Rule 94 requires an additional 2' Antenna Safety Clearance Zone. Refer to Section 16.1, Chart 16.1B. Owner of the antenna may purchase 1' or 2' of the Antenna Safety Clearance Zone. See section 4.3.

### **4.3 Purchase of Interest in Safety**

#### **Clearance Zone**

**A. Purchase or sale of the right to use space within the **Electrical Safety Clearance Zone**:**

Any Member planning to construct on a jointly owned pole where space is limited and all owners approve may purchase into the **Electrical** Safety Clearance Zone in accordance with General Order 95. The purchase or sale of the right to use this space shall be initiated on a Joint Pole Authorization and construction shall begin within the time limits prescribed in Section 18.1D. The constructing Member may purchase in one-foot increments to a maximum of two feet and must attach at the grade requested (see Section 16.0). Guard arms must be installed by the purchasing Member in the manner prescribed by General Order 95.

**B. Purchase of the right to use space within the Antenna Safety Clearance Zone:**

The antenna owner may construct into the Antenna Safety Clearance Zone in accordance with General Order 95, Rule 94. The purchase of the right to use this space shall be initiated on a Joint Pole Authorization and construction shall begin within the time limits prescribed in Section 18.1D. The constructing Member may purchase in one-foot increments to a maximum of two feet (see Section 16.0).

Note: General Order 95, Rule 94 requires an additional 2' Antenna Safety Clearance Zone. Refer to Section 16.1, Chart 16.1B.

## Southern California Joint Pole Committee

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

November 18, 2009

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. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Mr. Cory Autrey	Sprint-Nextel/Sprint Communications
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena (teleconference)
Ms. Janet Amuso	CA-CLEC LLC
Ms. Bridgette Courtney	Golden State Water
Ms. Charito DeCastro	City of Glendale
Mr. Rex Myers	City of Colton (teleconference)
Mr. Keith Shaggin	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Scott Hunter	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc
Mr. Rudy Villavicencio	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Mr. Mahendra Garg	City of Anaheim
Mr. Randall Starkey	Time-Warner (teleconference)
Ms. Tara Isid	NewPath Networks (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Gary Clark	City of Banning (teleconference)
Mr. Justin Cashmer	Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Mark Denning	M-Power/TelePacific (teleconference)
Mr. Steve Rodriguez	T-Mobile USA (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Comm/Local Serv
Ms. Shawn Henderson	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Mr. Daniel Lippert	City of Burbank
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Mr. Jim Eastwood	Southern California Edison
Ms. Jacquie Aguilar	Southern California Edison
Mr. Kyle Levy	Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Committee president Mr. Chow called the meeting to order at 9:10 am. Mr. Chow then called roll. After roll was taken it was verified that four members are not in attendance, those members are City of Vernon, ExTenet Systems, MCI/Metro and MCI Telecommunications.

**HOUSEKEEPING:**

Mr. Chow requested that those members who are teleconferencing, to mute their phones so that no interference is picked up. He added that those members who intend on remaining for lunch, complete their menu sheets, and submit them to Ms. Corella when completed.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Mr. Chow asked the members to review the October 21, 2009 Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. Mr. Autrey noted a typo on page 4. Ms. Corella responded that error noted and would make the correction. Mr. Autrey motioned to accept the minutes as corrected. Ms. Hernandez seconded the motion, which after the votes were taken passed unanimously.

**MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Corella reported that the October 2009 budget expenses are \$46,086.29. She added that the month of October is reflective of an average month.

**COMMUNICATIONS:**

*ATC Outdoor DAS*

Ms. Corella reported on the status of the application. She stated that the committee is waiting for a parent company guarantee from the applicant. She added that she was contacted by the applicant's legal and inquired if the guarantee provided for the CPUC would suffice as a guarantee for the SCJPC. She then proceeded to read the document verbatim (see attachment).

Mr. Autrey questioned if the members are satisfied with the parent guarantee would the applicant be invited for an interview shortly thereafter?

Ms. Corella responded that this would be the next step in the application process.

It was agreed that Ms. Corella would send the parent guarantee via email as an attachment to all members to review and get their vote on acceptance or non-acceptance of this type guarantee. The deadline date for member response is December 16, 2009.

### Deposition Subpoena

Ms. Corella reported that she received a deposition subpoena served to the custodian of the SCJPC pole records. She stated that the subpoena is in regards to Judy Lopez et al, and the respondent is Southern California Edison. She contacted the committee attorney for legal advice in regards to the deposition subpoena and he directed her to only directly answer the questions posed, and not to offer any additional unsolicited information. She further stated that she and Ms. Baccus both gave their depositions the prior day. She further reported that Ms. Baccus answered questions in reference to the pole card records, and Ms. Corella answered questions in reference to the SCJPC Agreement.

Mr. Chow reported that in communicating with the SCE legal, he was informed that when an entity is subpoenaed to produce a large value of information that is onerous to produce, the entity does not have to produce it. Therefore, when the JPC office receives a subpoena of any type it would be prudent to contact the committee attorney for direction. If the time required to compile the subpoenaed documents would entail several weeks, then the attorney would get involved and respond that the task represents a hardship on the committee.

In conclusion, whenever the committee office receives a subpoena, the current officers and the committee legal must be notified prior to moving forward with any action(s).

### Graffiti Removal

Ms. Corella reported that a vendor contacted her and inquired if he could present a demonstration of how his organization's graffiti removal product performs. She responded that if he was allowed to demonstrate his product, than this courtesy would need to be extended to all vendors and this is not the reason the members meet monthly. She informed the vendor that he could send a notice via email to be read to the members at their next Board meeting. The email sent by the vendor has a video attachment should any members be interested in viewing the video. She then inquired if any members were interested in this product she would forward the email message and attached video. Those members requesting information are Mr. Dana Fabing of the City of Lompoc, Mr. Cory Autrey of Sprint/Nextel, and Ms. Paula Haney of NextG Networks.

## **SPECIAL REPORTS**

There were no special reports.

## **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

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

Mr. Hunter reported that the authorized costs ad hoc committee met on November 10, 2009. He reported that the first and second items on the agenda were tabled in order to concentrate on the latest pole price draft. The consensus is to place the pole price draft on the current agenda discussion calendar for discussion and possible approval.

### **Operating Committee**

Mr. Autrey reported that the operating committee met on October 21, 2009. He reported that some items on the current calendar are from the Operating committee. At the last meeting the operating committee was in the process of renewing the lease. However, in the interim another agent with a property, which the committee has earlier visited, approached the ad hoc committee to reconsider the property. The current lease has reverted to a 30-day month-to-month status until the committee is able to agree upon a location. This issue would be discussed extensively at the next meeting. Also on the current agenda is the incoming years budget.

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

Mr. Chow reported that the consensus on the ad hoc committee on Reorganization is to table it until January 2009.

### **Routine Revision Committee**

Ms. Henderson reported that the Routine Revision ad hoc committee met November 10, 2009 and discussed in depth Item 1491: Form 49 Reformat. This item is on the discussion calendar of the current agenda. She recommended reviewing the minutes of the meeting for further details.

### **Computer Communications ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Chow reported that Computer Communications met on November 10, 2009. He reported that Ms. Goetz chaired the meeting, and requested that members review the minutes of that meeting for any details.

### **Pole Loading ad hoc Committee**

Mr. Wolfe was not available to report. Please refer to the minutes of the Pole Loading ad hoc meetings available on the SCJPC.net web site.

### **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

#### **2010 SCJPC Officers**

**President** – Southern California Edison

**Vice-President** – Sprint-Nextel

**Chairs:**

Operating Ctte - Sprint-Nextel

Routine Revision – AT&T Local Services

Authorized Costs – City of Los Angeles – DWP

Computer Comm – Southern California Edison

Reorganization - AT&T California

Basic JPA Trning- City of Burbank

Pole-Loading - AT&T California/City of Los Angeles

Mr. Chow solicited a motion to approve the consent calendar. Ms. Hernandez motioned to approve the consent calendar. Mr. Garg seconded the motion, which as a result of the votes taken passed unanimously.

### **DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

#### **Item 1475: 2010 Operating Budget**

Mr. Autrey inquired if the members had an opportunity to review the proposed 2010 operating budget. He reported that the budget includes moving expenses in the event that the decision is to relocate the JPC office. The iPAM development dollars have been carried over in the event that the application is launched. He added that the dollars in red are expensed equally not proportionately in that they benefit all members equally.

Mr. Lippert inquired if the furniture dollars would be expensed if the JPC office does not relocate. Mr. Autrey responded that the operating committee has

been discussing the purchasing of a new conference table and chairs, and the consensus is to purchase the furniture if the office relocates or does not relocate.

There was no opposition to the proposed budget; therefore, Mr. Chow solicited a motion to approve the 2010 Operating Budget. Mr. Autrey motioned to approve the 2010 Operating Budget as proposed. Mr. Hunter seconded the motion. Mr. Chow then tallied the votes, and the motion passed unanimously.

### **Item 1492: 2010 Pole Prices**

Mr. Autrey opened discussion on this item by inquiring why those entities, such as T-Mobile and AT&T Mobility, who historically do not set many poles, opt to set and publish individual pole prices. He added that his purpose of opening discussion on this is that the JPC office works with multiple pole costs schedules. He further added that initially the objective of the weighted average is to have one pole price schedule per year.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that he does not grasp Mr. Autrey's concern. He added that T-Mobile expensed time and effort to arrive at their costs, which in their opinion is in line with how they transact business, and opted to publish their costs individually.

Mr. Autrey reiterated that his concern is the impact it has on the JPC office staff having to work with so many price schedules.

Mr. Rodriguez responded that since they do not set poles often, their pricing schedule would not be utilized that often, thus not creating a problem for the staff. However, in the event that a pole is set by T-Mobile, they have their prices in place and need not default to the weighted average.

When questioned, Ms. Baccus responded that the various price schedules are not a problem for the staff. She added that it does become a problem when a member one year opts to publish their costs individually, and the following year falls into the weighted average, and then the next year reverts to individual prices. It is the inconsistencies of the method members publish their costs from year to year that becomes troublesome. She reiterated that the various price schedules are not a problem.

In clarification, Mr. Chow stated that the primary concern of Sprint-Nextel is the impact of several price schedules, but it appears as Ms. Baccus commented the maintenance of various price schedules are not a great concern with the JPC staff. The issue is when members fluctuate from the weighted average method to the individual method year after year.

It was noted that those members who do not set poles regularly would have a greater expense when purchasing poles from vendors than those members who purchase poles in greater volume and receive a discounted rate.

Mr. Wolfe stated that he is not certain if the agreement states that members must submit costs. He added that in the NCJPA, the consensus now is to submit pole costs every other year, in that it appears there is not a great change in costs from year to year. This new method appears to have simplified the process.

Mr. Chow than solicited a motion to accept the pole prices as drafted. Ms. Hernandez motioned to approve the pole costs as drafted. Mr. Hunter seconded the motion. After Mr. Chow tallied the votes, the motion passed unanimously. The pole prices are approved effective January 1, 2010.

**Item 1491: Form 49 Revised**

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion on this item. She stated that the Routine Revision ad hoc committee agreed that the Form 49 Tracer/Multi-Party Router was outdated and required revising. Ms. Hernandez explained that the form has been simplified and revised to be user friendlier. She added that since more than one contactor is engaged by the same member(s), the multi-party router on the JPA would ensure that the JPA is returned to the correct initiating party. The members discussed the form and it's correct usages. She emphasized that when a JPA is denied, this Form 49 and not the Form 7 should be utilized.

There was no further discussion on this item. Mr. Chow solicited a motion to approve Form 49 as revised. Ms. Prescott motioned to accept the form as revised. Ms. Hernandez seconded the motion. After Mr. Chow tallied the votes, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Lippert stated that he would review the Basic JPA training manual available on line to determine where to insert the newly revised Form 49.

**OTHER ITEMS:** Unfinished Business

- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS (03/14/07)
- Item 1440: Review of 1998 Agreement - RE-ORGANIZATION (05/18/07)
- Item 1446: Rev. of Sect. 4.0/4.1 & Rev.of Hdbk-ROUTINE REVISION (08/15/07)
- Item 1462: Sect 7.12 OT Cost/Disaster Replmt - ROUTINE REVISION (04/08/08)
- Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement - ROUTINE REVISION (09/17/08)
- Item 1475: 2010 Operating Budget - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1481: American Tower Mbrship App. - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/30/08)
- Item 1482: Non-Disclosure for Handbook - OPERATING COMMITTEE (1/21/09)
- Item 1487: Review of Auth Costs – AUTHORIZED COSTS (04/14/09)
- Item 1491: Form 49 Reformat - ROUTINE REVISION (05/20/09)
- Item 1492: 2010 Pole Prices - AUTHORIZED COSTS (06/09/09)
- Item 1493: Evaluate Pole Load Programs – POLE-LOADING (06/17/09)
- Item 1494: PTD of Composite Poles - ROUTINE REVISION (09/15/09)
- Item 1495: Pole Inspections - ROUTINE REVISION (10/13/09)
- Item 1496: Inaccessible Pole Removal - ROUTINE REVISION (10/13/09)

There was no discussion on unfinished business items.

## **Item 1485: *Environmental Issues***

Mr. Wolfe reported that there is a current lawsuit in regards to Penta (Pentachlorophenol) in the Bay area, and it involves pole owners. He added he is of the opinion that the SCJPC should be aware of the issue with this type of treatment and that Penta is no longer viewed favorably.

## **New Business**

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

#### **Item 1482: *Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) For Handbook, By-Laws and Agreement***

Mr. Autrey opened discussion by stating that the Operating ad hoc committee had the committee attorney draft a generic NDA. This NDA is for entities that are requesting a copy of the above-mentioned documents. He added that an entity that intends to be bound to an agreement by signing a resolution should have the opportunity to review the documents the agreement alludes to. The objective today is that members review the NDA and determine if the document would serve the committee well when releasing the above-mentioned documents to interested parties.

Mr. Chow inquired if the NDA was for those parties that have applied, or for parties that are interested in membership but have not paid the \$725.00 application fee. He added that according to his recollection, the NDA is for those parties who have applied and paid their fee.

Mr. Autrey responded that the NDA is written with the applicant in mind, in that the document refers to “the applicant” throughout the document.

It was agreed that the NDA could be used for both an applicant and edited to fit the request of an interested party.

#### **LA County Permits Requirements**

Mr. Chow reported that a meeting was held with SCE, AT&T California and Los Angeles County. He added that Ms. Aguilar and Mr. Wolfe would report on that meeting.

Ms. Aguilar opened by stating that LA County has taken pictures of areas where there are side-by-side poles. She added that the county wants the second pole(s) removed and are at a loss for the correct contact person. She added that moving forward, when SCE applies for a permit, whether it is LA County or a municipality, they would identify the other joint members on the permit application. They would identify the pole setter, pole number and the PTD member.

Mr. Wolfe stated that historically in a two-party world the lowest member on the pole would PTD. He added that taking the process outlined in the Routine in regards to the time frames, and addressing the issue of PTD that this would satisfy the county and municipalities and give some focus on this issue. They are aware of the time frame when they can expect the second pole to be removed. He further added that from the time the Form 48 is issued, and all members have transferred their facilities allowing the PTD party to remove the pole, that this scenario should transpire in a 90-day time frame or sooner. He stated that in order to ensure that this method works must also include a situation scenario that when the C class visits the site to remove the pole, and there remains facilities that did not transfer in the time frame, that the C class member transfer the facilities and bill the correct authorized cost.

Ms. Aguilar then related the step process. She stated that SCE would apply for a joint permit and identify the PTD party. There would be permit A for the setting party (SCE) and permit B for the removing party. The permit costs would be shared. Currently, the county is billing SCE \$100.00 to drive to the site and inspect the pole left in the field. As far as SCE is concerned the work required by SCE on these pole(s) is complete.

Mr. Wolfe reported that LA County is attempting to acquire some history of the SCJPC in order to arrive at a reasonable permit fee. He added that he would like to see the permit attached to the JPAs. The permit has been acquired by SCE and it is also the permit for the PTD party.

Ms. Aguilar reiterated that when SCE applies for their permits, they would identify the removing party. Currently, the only party being billed is SCE, but in the future the county could be billing joint members when necessary for work incurred by their inspectors. She concluded that the primary concern with the county is the old pole not being removed from the site, which has prompted numerous complaints from their constituents and those in authority. She added that the county is no longer issuing permits to SCE as readily as in the past. She further added that this might impact all members in creating a difficult situation when applying for permits for their specific projects.

Mr. Autrey inquired when would joint members become aware of what the permit costs shared with SCE would be. Mr. Chow responded that he is not certain at this time; however, it might be at the end of the process when SCE is aware of the costs from LA County. In this situation the cost would not be billed via a JPA but possibly a separate invoice.

Ms. Hernandez commented that she is in total agreement that this is a problem and members should be sharing in the cost. However, she added from her experience the trend with PTD poles has always been low priority on the list. She questioned if this problem/trend would be remedied by sharing in the costs of the permitting issues? Is this resolution going to raise PTD higher on the priority list?

Mr. Chow responded that since SCE is identifying the PTD party on their permits, and if the PTD party fails to respond in a timely manner, the PTD party could expect to be contacted by the county. This in itself might raise the PTD issue to a higher priority.

The consensus is to document the request for LA County permits process and establish a permit fee authorized costs at the ad hoc level.

**Unknown Items:**

**SCJPC Salary Survey**

Mr. Autrey reported that the members would be receiving a salary survey the following month. He wanted to give the members advance notification that the Operating committee would be reviewing the current salary ranges within the JPC office, and this would require salary data in regards to their organization. Mr. Autrey then reviewed the salary survey packet

The members discussed that the questionnaire should indicate if the data is based on collection bargaining.

Mr. Chow stated that he is of the opinion that there would be a wide range of data collected, and that the Operating committee would need to determine how to factor the data to arrive at a reasonable salary range.

Mr. Wolfe remarked that the salary structures between collective bargaining, non-collecting bargaining and municipalities would reflect differently.

It was agreed that the survey would be revised to address the different types of compensation methods prior to sending the questionnaire out to the members.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Routine Revision	01/12/10	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Computer Committee	01/12/10	Following	Routine Revision
Authorized Costs	01/12/10	Following	Computer Committee
Reorganization	01/12/10	Following	Authorized Costs
Pole Loading Committee	12/09/09	9:30 a.m.	Committee Office
Administrative Board	01/20/10	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	01/20/10	Following	Administrative Board

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Mr. Chow adjourned the meeting at 11:45 a.m., until January 20, 2010.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mr. Larry Chow, President.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operations

**ATTACHMENT FOLLOWS:**



February 21, 2008

Public Utility Commission of California  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**Re: CPCN Application of ATC Outdoor DAS, LLC**

To Whom It May Concern:

American Tower Corporation ("American Tower") is a Delaware corporation publicly traded on the New York Stock Exchange (symbol: AMT) and the indirect parent of ATC Outdoor DAS, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company. ATC Outdoor DAS, LLC is the entity recently formed by American Tower to engage in the operation of outdoor distributed antenna systems business, which provides RF over fiber transport services to wireless telecommunications carriers. Utilizing funds from American Tower's consolidated cash flow and/or general capital resources, American Tower has the ability to secure ATC Outdoor DAS, LLC's statutory obligations as a CPCN in California, and will, to the extent necessary, provide ATC Outdoor DAS, LLC with a minimum of \$100,000.00 in available capital to sustain its operations in California through the first twelve months of operation.

Evidence of American Tower's consolidated cash flow and general capital resources, may be found in American Tower's most recently filed quarterly report on Form 10-Q with respect to the third quarter of 2007, filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on November 9, 2007 ("Quarterly Report"). As noted in the Quarterly Report, among American Tower's various sources of capital resources is American Tower's June 8, 2007 \$1.25 billion credit facility. As of October 25, 2007, American Tower had the ability to draw down approximately \$561.3 million under this revolving credit facility.

If you have any questions with regard to the foregoing, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Steven Moskowitz  
Executive Vice President,  
President US Tower Division

Cc: Brad Singer  
Gerard Ainsztein  
Michael McCormack  
Maggie Howell