

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

1400 Montefino Ave. Suite 100

Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Phone (909) 348-5920

Fax (909) 348-5925

January 19, 2011

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

Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Mr. James Eastwood	Southern California Edison
Mr. Charles Johnson	Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California
Mr. Scott Hunter	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Tony Mai	City of Anaheim
Mr. Doug Schmaderer	City of Pasadena
Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Ms. Debbie Wooten	NextG Networks
Ms. Kourtney Aboudara	NextG Networks
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Comm/Local Services
Mr. Charles Johnson	MCI Comm/MCI Metro (teleconference)
Mr. Randall Starkey	Time-Warner Cable (teleconference)
Ms. Bridgette Courtney	Golden State Water (teleconference)
Ms. Shawn Henderson	AT&T Mobility
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint-Nextel/Sprint Comm.
Mr. Annetta Baker	City of Colton (teleconference)
Mr. Gary Clark	City of Banning (teleconference)
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc (teleconference)
Ms. Maryan Farajzadeh	City of Vernon (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Ennis	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Larry Thorne	NewPath Networks (teleconference)
Mr. Larry Thorne	ATC-Outdoor DAS (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Jernnie Corella	Committee Staff

CALL TO ORDER:

Committee president Mr. Chow called the meeting to order at 9:15 am. He then proceeded with the roll call by member utility, requesting that the representatives respond with their name, and the utility they are representing. When roll call was completed, those members recorded not in attendance are *City of*

Burbank, City of Glendale, City of Azusa, XO Communications, M-Power/TelePacific, and ExTeNet Systems.

HOUSEKEEPING:

Mr. Chow requested that member's who are teleconferencing mute their phones so that no interference is picked up. He added that if the teleconferencing members must step away from the meeting to please inform the chair when they leave and return to the meeting, in the event that a vote call transpired in their absence. He concluded by stating that the lunch order menu would be distributed shortly for those members who intend on remaining.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Chow asked the members to review the *November 17, 2010* Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. When reviewing was complete, Ms. Hernandez noted a typo on page 7, second to last paragraph. The number *105* should be revised to read *109*. The correction was noted. Mr. Chow then solicited a motion to accept the minutes as corrected. Ms. Haney motioned to accept the minutes of *November 17, 2010* as corrected. Ms. Hernandez seconded the motion. At the completion of tallying the votes, the motion carried.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Ms. Corella reported that the December 2010 operating expenses are \$57,669.60. This expense is above average due to December reflective of a 3 payroll period month. The members were assessed the total operating expenses for the month.

COMMUNICATIONS:

Ms. Corella reported that December was a quiet month in regards to communication. She did receive a call from the City of Santa Monica inquiring about the status of their membership application. Ms. Corella stated that the applicant has submitted their financial documents, which are on the current discussion calendar, for review by the committee. If the documents are satisfactory to committee members the next step in the application process is to invite the applicant to the following Board meeting for an interview.

Mr. Schmaderer inquired about contact information requested by the City of Los Angeles. Mr. Hunter responded that the request pertains to structure moves. He reported an incident where a church was set to move and in the process a cable was discovered. The City of Los Angeles experienced difficulty in contacting the correct party to remove the cable. He added that the department responsible for

moving structures had an antiquated contact list; therefore, the objective for the request is that the City of Los Angeles would like to update the contact list with the current and proper contact names and numbers.

SPECIAL REPORTS

There are no special reports.

SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:

ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements

Mr. Hunter reported the ad hoc met on January 11, 2011. The members reviewed the authorized costs draft, and discovered some errors. The consensus is to rework the draft and the ad hoc committee members will review the final draft prior to bringing to the Board for approval. The members reviewed and approved the 2011 pole prices which are on the current discussion calendar for possible Board approval. The members continue to discuss Item 1515: AC 5 (E) Lowering. New item numbers have been assigned to this ad hoc, they are Item 1517: Traffic and Pedestrian Control and Item 1517: Hardscape/Landscape Restoration.

Operating Committee

Ms. Smith stated that the Operating committee met on November 17, 2010. She reported that the members discussed space and grade notations on guy poles, and clarification on sections 4.0 and 4.3. ADT has been selected as the alarm system for the JPC office. There was brief discussion on the Hyperlink FRIEND and maintenance contracts. She concluded by suggesting members review the minutes available on the SCJPC.net web site for further details.

Routine Revision Committee

Ms. Hernandez stated that the ad hoc met January 11, 2011. She reported that the members reviewed the revisions that were agreed upon by the ad hoc committee during the year's meetings. The members discussed the minimum pole class requirement chart in section 15. The consensus is to have the power utility member's review and update the chart if necessary. Discussed as well are sections 4.1-A, and 4.1-B, and the cross references from sections 7.7, and 5.4 in that these two sections do not stand alone. A new alternative to wood pole class has been added. The new class is CM and it represents Composite Fiberglass multiple piece

as opposed to CF – Composite Fiberglass single piece. She advised members to review the minutes of the meeting for further details.

Computer Communications ad hoc Committee

Mr. Chow reported that the ad hoc met on January 11, 2011. He stated that the members reviewed the Multiple Pole Search software created by Diamond Bar Web. There are some enhancements to the software that the members are requesting at this time. However, the application is nearly complete. He recommended that members review the minutes of the meeting for further details.

Pole Loading ad hoc Committee

This ad hoc is a standing committee should any issues require immediate attention. This committee would meet when deemed necessary.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

No items for consent.

DISCUSSION CALENDAR:

Item 1513: City of Santa Monica Application – Financial Document

Mr. Chow opened discussion by inquiring if any members require additional time to review the submitted financial document provided by the applicant. The members did not require additional review time for the document. Mr. Wolfe stated that AT&T California finds the applicants financial document satisfactory. Mr. Hunter stated that the City of Los Angeles, Department of Water and Power also finds the financial document satisfactory.

Ms. Ennis moved to go forward with the next step in the application process.

The consensus is to invite the applicant to the next Board meeting for the interview process.

2011 Pole Prices

The final draft for the proposed 2011 pole prices have been agreed upon by the Authorized Costs ad hoc committee and is now ready for Board approval. Mr. Chow opened the floor for discussion on the proposed 2011 pole prices. After review of the pole prices, Ms. Hernandez motioned to accept the proposed pole prices for

2011. Mr. Wolfe seconded the motion. After the votes were tallied the motion carried.

OTHER ITEMS: Unfinished Business

- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS (03/14/07)
- Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement - ROUTINE REVISION (09/17/08)
- Item 1487: Review of Auth Costs – AUTHORIZED COSTS (04/14/09)
- Item 1495: Pole Inspections - ROUTINE REVISION (10/13/09)
- Item 1503: Create FTP for Pole Loading - COMPUTER COMM (04/13/10)
- Item 1504: Arbitration Process – ROUTINE REVISION (04/21/10)
- Item 1507: 2011 Pole Prices - AUTHORIZED COSTS (07/13/10)
- Item 1508: Clarification of JPC Responsibilities - ROUTINE REVISION (07/13/10)
- Item 1509: Perform & Sal Treat Proc & Doc - OPERATING CTTE (07/21/10)
- Item 1511: Form 44 Process - ROUTINE REVISION (08/18/10)
- Item 1512: Oper Guidelines/Proc for OM - OPERATING CTTE (08/18/10)
- Item 1513: City of Santa Monica Application - OPERATING CTTE (08/18/10)
- Item 1514: Form 48 Final Bill Timeframe - ROUTINE REVISION (09/19/10)
- Item 1515: AC 5 (E) Lowering - AUTHORIZED COSTS (10/12/10)
- Item 1516: Form 48 Simplification - ROUTINE REVISION (11/09/10)
- Item 1517: Traffic Control/Pedestrian Control - AUTHORIZED COSTS (1/11/11)
- Item 1518: Hard/Land Restor - AUTHORIZED COSTS/ROUTINE REVISION (1/11/11)

Item 1507: 2011 Pole Prices is now closed.

Item 1519: *Environmental Issues*

This is a standing item.

New Business

Known Items:

Pole Class on JPAs - SCE

Mr. Chow stated that in 2009 a decision was agreed upon that pole class would be required on JPAs. He added that the pole class would be effectively *required* on JPAs that were initiated in 2010; however if a JPA was initiated in 2009 and prior the pole class was *optional* but good practice for future use. He added that the JPC staff requires some direction in that SCE has submitted JPAs that were initiated in 2009, and are returned for lack of pole class notation. Ms. Pranata stated that she was of the opinion that the determining date was the date the pole was set. It was clarified that the determining date would be Date Sent.

Unknown Items:

Payables/Receivables – AT&T California

Mr. Wolfe reported that AT&T California desires to collect money owed them and to pay monies due. To this he added that when there is a transition of a member working with a contracting company, there is a shift in the paying process, and a transfer of responsibility to another party. He has directed his organization to work directly with the contracting companies for resolution of payment. He concluded stating that he would like to have the contractors aware of this direction within his organization.

Fiber Identification – AT&T California

Mr. Wolfe shared an experience regarding fiber identification. He reported that SCE identified fiber on a pole as belonging to AT&T California. He added that he could not find on record this attachment, and directed personnel within his organization to research this issue. He concluded by stating that in these rare instances, members should be patient with one another and willing to work together.

SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Routine Revision	02/08/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Authorized Costs	02/08/11	Following	Routine Revision
Computer Comm	02/08/11	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	02/16/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	02/16/11	Following	Administrative Board

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Chow adjourned the meeting at 9:55 a.m., until February 16, 2011.

Mr. Larry Chow, President.

Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operations

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

1400 Montefino Ave. Suite 100

Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Phone (909) 348-5920

Fax (909) 348-5925

February 16, 2011

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

Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Mr. James Eastwood	Southern California Edison
Mr. Charles Johnson	Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California
Mr. Scott Hunter	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless (teleconference)
Mr. Tony Mai	City of Anaheim
Mr. Doug Schmaderer	City of Pasadena
Mr. Joe Armstrong	City of Pasadena
Mr. Lawrence Yao	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Mr. Tigren Patatanyan	City of Glendale
Mr. Daniel Lippert	City of Burbank
Mr. Dan Kjar	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Mr. Mark Denning	M-Power/TelePacific (teleconference)
Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Mr. Charles Johnson	MCI Comm/MCI Metro (teleconference)
Mr. Randall Starkey	Time-Warner Cable (teleconference)
Ms. Bridgette Burton	Golden State Water (teleconference)
Ms. Shawn Henderson	AT&T Mobility
Ms. Alicia Smith	Spr-Nextel/Spr. Comm.(teleconference)
Mr. Annetta Baker	City of Colton (teleconference)
Ms. Maryan Farajzadeh	City of Vernon (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Ennis	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Larry Thorne	NewPath Networks (teleconference)
Mr. Larry Thorne	CA CLEC, LLC (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Jernnie Corella	Committee Staff

Guests:

Mr. Jory Wolf	City of Santa Monica
Mr. Gary Carter	City of Santa Monica

CALL TO ORDER:

Committee president Mr. Wolfe called the meeting to order at 9:05 am. He announced that this was his initial chairing of the Administrative Board meeting in that he is the 2011 committee president. He then proceeded with the roll call by member utility, requesting that the representatives respond with their name, and the utility they are representing. When roll call was completed, those members recorded not in attendance are *AT&T Communications, AT&T Local Services, City of Banning, City of Lompoc, ATC Outdoor DAS, and ExTeNet Systems.*

HOUSEKEEPING:

Mr. Wolfe requested that member's who are teleconferencing mute their phones so that no interference is picked up. He added that if the teleconferencing members must step away from the meeting to please inform the chair when they leave and return to the meeting, in the event that a vote call transpired in their absence. He concluded by stating the agenda would not be followed as listed in that the City of Santa Monica, who is slated in special reports has arrived. Therefore, the Special Reports portion of the current agenda would be addressed now.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Wolfe inquired if the members had the opportunity to review the *January 19, 2011* Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. When reviewing was complete, Mr. Chow motioned to accept the January 19, 2011 minutes as written. Ms. Haney seconded the motion. At the completion of tallying the votes, the motion carried unanimously.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Ms. Corella reported that the January 2011 operating expenses are \$50,986.15. This expense is slightly above average. The members were assessed the total operating expenses for the month.

COMMUNICATIONS:

Public Wireless

Ms. Corella reported that she has received communication from Public Wireless expressing an interest in committee membership. She then proceeded to read the communications to the members (see attachment I).

Mr. Chow inquired if Mr. Wolfe was aware of Public Wireless applying for membership with the NCJPA. Mr. Wolfe responded that he is not aware of an

application from Public Wireless. An item number will be assigned to the Operating committee agenda for Public Wireless Application.

SPECIAL REPORTS

City of Santa Monica

Mr. Wolfe welcomed the representatives from the City of Santa Monica, Mr. Jory Wolf, and Mr. Gary Carter to the meeting and then he allowed for introductions.

Mr. Wolf opened by giving a brief synopsis on the specifics of the City of Santa Monica. He stated that the city has many public safety and transit application projects in the works. They would like the opportunity to utilize wood poles to aid with their many projects. He added that the MTA is building an expo in the city with projected completion in 2015, and disclosed other planned projects. He mentioned that there are security cameras in the city installed for public safety.

Mr. Wolfe then proceeded to question the representatives using the template questionnaire provided in the packet. Mr. Wolfe inquired if the city currently maintains any wood poles. Mr. Wolf responded that the city does not currently maintain wood poles but has a limited number of steel poles.

Mr. Eastwood inquired if the city intends on using wood poles for camera installation. Mr. Wolf responded that the wood pole would be for fiber communication.

Mr. Wolfe inquired if the city intends to cross out of the city boundaries to adjacent cities. Mr. Wolf responded not at this time, however, perhaps in the future for disaster recoveries.

Mr. Wolfe than inquired the size and type facilities the city would be installing onto poles. Mr. Wolf responded that the city would be installing 288 count single node fiber. He added that the city would be engaging SCJPC approved vendors.

Mr. Wolfe stated that the committee does not approve member's vendors. He added that the vendor should be an industry specific vendor that has the ability to construct per GO 95.

Mr. Chow stated that there is a list of approved contractors available to members on the SCJPC.net website.

Mr. Wolfe informed the applicant representative that Board meeting attendance is mandatory, and a standard has been set where members must attend a minimum of 80% attendance. He added that there is a penalty fee imposed to those members that fall below the twelve month rolling attendance requirement.

Mr. Wolf responded that the city is cognitive of the responsibilities to membership.

Mr. Chow informed the applicants that although you are a member of the committee, this does not guarantee allowance to joint ownership on poles. All members have the right to deny ownership/access to pole(s) for multiple just causes such as engineering and safety issues. He added that another avenue for access to poles is a lease option should a decision be reached not to join the committee.

Mr. Wolf responded that they are aware of this option, and would prefer to access poles via ownership.

Mr. Chow inquired if the city would be setting poles. Mr. Wolf responded in the positive.

Mr. Schmaderer inquired if the city intends on processing their respective JPAs. Mr. Wolf responded that they intend on outsourcing this task.

The members informed the applicants of several situations such as wind loading, involved with joint pole ownership to aid in their determination of membership.

Mr. Carter concluded by stating that the City of Santa Monica has given SCJPC membership much consideration, and is certain that this is the best avenue toward pole attachment for their future projects.

Mr. Wolfe thanked Mr. Wolf and Mr. Carter for their time and stated that they would be kept abreast of the status of their application.

SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:

ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements

In that Mr. Wolfe chaired the last Authorized Cost Elements committee meeting he reported the ad hoc met on February 8, 2011. He further reported that the members reviewed Item 1487: Review of Authorized Costs Draft V. He added that there is a question in regards to those items with a zero total cost. Members did not submit costs for the zero costs items. It was agreed that those current costs that do not have costs submitted would have the 2010 costs rolled over into 2011. This would leave open for discussion those newly added costs with zero total costs to be determined if they should be deleted. Mr. Wolfe concluded by referring the members to review the minutes of the meeting available on the SCJPC.net website.

Operating Committee

Ms. Smith reported that the operating committee met January 19, 2011. She reported that the members reviewed the standing agenda items. She added that two items of note are that the JPC staff would no longer code incoming VZ JPAs with their budget codes, the coding would now be the responsibility of Verizon California. The second issue of note is the pole ownership by percentage. The members have been notified if they choose to continue to have the JPC office calculate percentages. She concluded by suggesting members refer to the minutes of the meeting for further details.

Routine Revision Committee

In the absence of Ms. Hernandez, Ms. Corella reported that the ad hoc met February 8, 2011. She reported that Item 1504: Arbitration Process was discussed. The verbiage, "arbitration" has been removed from the Routine Handbook. However, Mr. Wolfe suggested revising the section to state that JPAs can be disputed via a Form 7. She added that per Ms. Hernandez, the process of utilizing a Form 7 to dispute a JPA is practiced successfully amongst members today. Therefore, this item number is now closed. She further reported that Item 1511: Form 44 Process was discussed and some verbiage and an example have been created to be incorporated into the handbook. The revisions are on the current agenda discussion calendar. The committee discussed the issue of denying a change to a JPA for the mere fact that the 45 day time frame has elapsed. It was agreed that a denial of a change to a JPA after the 45 day lapse must only be for a valid reason such as engineering concerns. There is a JPA Alert addressing this issue now available on the SCJPC.net website. She also reported that the ad hoc discussed inspection cycles. The concern is how often should poles be inspected and/or how much time should lapse before a member bills for a pole inspection again. Mr. Chow interjected stating that his organization brought this issue to the table. He added that inspections fees should be related to GO 165 issues only and not internal requirements. Ms. Corella added that she would be contacting those members with an approved maintenance program in the Routine Handbook requesting they provide their inspection cycles.

Lastly, Ms. Corella reported that the ad hoc committee agreed on how to notate clearance attachments on JPAs. There is a JPA Alert to address this issue as well. Ms. Corella concluded by urging all members to visit the JPA Alert page and distribute the alerts amongst pertinent staff. Please refer to the minutes of the meeting for further details.

Computer Communications ad hoc Committee

Mr. Chow reported that the ad hoc met on February 8, 2011. He stated the members discussed the Multiple Pole Search application that has been developed by Diamond Bar Web. The functions of the application would allow members to upload an Excel spreadsheet and the application would create a report with pole information such as joint owners, grade and space and other pole details. The application should be complete and available within the next two to three months. He concluded by referring the members to the minutes of the meeting for further details.

Pole Loading ad hoc Committee

This ad hoc is a standing committee should any issues require immediate attention. This committee would meet when deemed necessary.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

No items for consent.

DISCUSSION CALENDAR:

Item 1487: Review of Authorized Costs Draft VI

The members reviewed and discussed AC draft VI. For the newly created costs for composite fiberglass arms, if there are no costs provided, it was agreed the cost would be that of wood. The members continued to review the draft. When the review was complete Mr. Wolfe entertained a motion to accept authorized costs draft VI as revised. Mr. Hunter motioned to accept the authorized costs draft VI as revised. Mr. Chow seconded the motion. Mr. Wolfe tallied the votes and the motion carried unanimously.

Item 1511: Form 44 Process – Verbiage and example

Ms. Corella reported that verbiage has been added to Section 18.6 Form 44, and an example has been created for Section 18. The verbiage added is to address the Form 44 process after the JPC office has mailed the forms to respective members, and the action to be taken by members (see attachment II). The members reviewed and briefly discussed the section revisions and corrected a grammatical error. Ms. Haney then motioned to accept the revisions to section 18.6 with grammatical correction. Ms. Hunter seconded the motion, which after the votes were tallied, the motion carried.

Item 1515: AC 5 (E) Lowering Costs

Ms. Corella reported that the Routine Revision ad hoc committee would like to open discussion on the costs of lowering a pole versus pulling. Mr. Wolfe opened discussion by stating that there is a disparity between pulling the butt and lowering what is left of pole after topping. He believes that the lowering of the remaining wood could be anywhere from 50 feet to a five foot segment. Therefore, in his opinion it is difficult to view both actions as similar. He added that in a backyard situation, lowering is less complicated than pulling and less labor intensive. The price would be an increment of labor. He added that if a cost for lowering is considered, it should be for straight labor, no equipment consideration if your truck is accessible.

After discussion, it was agreed to remove the verbiage, “2 cuts” from AC 5 (C). This item is to remain open for discussion at the ad hoc level.

Item 1518: Hardscape and Landscape Restoration – AC 13 modified.

The members reviewed the verbiage added to AC 13. Mr. Wolfe stated that it would be difficult to assign an authorized cost to this item in that it could run from minor restoration to major. He added that AT&T California restores as was or better.

Ms. Corella stated that this item is in both Routine and Authorized Costs ad hoc committees that if a cost is agreed verbiage would be required in Routine for clarification and direction.

Mr. Hunter stated that the costs would tie to different price ranges.

Mr. Chow stated that what prompted SCE to bring this issue to the table is that his organization has dealt with about 30 instances where minor masonry work was required. He added that the average cost is approximately \$800.00 to \$900.00. He suggested an authorized cost for minor restoration, and special agreement for major restoration. After brief discussion it was agreed to return this item to the ad hoc for further work.

OTHER ITEMS: Unfinished Business

- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS (03/14/07)
- Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement - ROUTINE REVISION (09/17/08)
- Item 1487: Review of Auth Costs – AUTHORIZED COSTS (04/14/09)
- Item 1495: Pole Inspections - ROUTINE REVISION (10/13/09)
- Item 1503: Create FTP for Pole Loading - COMPUTER COMM (04/13/10)
- Item 1508: Clarification of JPC Responsibilities - ROUTINE REVISION (07/13/10)
- Item 1509: Perform & Sal Treat Proc & Doc - OPERATING CTTE (07/21/10)
- Item 1511: Form 44 Process - ROUTINE REVISION (08/18/10)
- Item 1512: Oper Guidelines/Proc for OM - OPERATING CTTE (08/18/10)
- Item 1513: City of Santa Monica Application - OPERATING CTTE (08/18/10)
- Item 1514: Form 48 Final Bill Timeframe - ROUTINE REVISION (09/19/10)
- Item 1515: AC 5 (E) Lowering - AUTHORIZED COSTS (10/12/10)
- Item 1516: Form 48 Simplification - ROUTINE REVISION (11/09/10)
- Item 1517: Traffic Control/Pedestrian Control - AUTHORIZED COSTS (1/11/11)
- Item 1518: Hard/Land Restor - AUTHORIZED COSTS/ROUTINE REVISION (1/11/11)
- Item 1520: Operating Expenses, Proport vs Equal - OPERATING CTTE (01/19/11)

Item 1519: *Environmental Issues*

This is a standing item.

New Business

Known Items:

Item 1517: Traffic Control/Pedestrian Control

Mr. Eastwood documented when pedestrian traffic control is required and when it is not required (see attachment III). He distributed the document to the attending members and stated that he would email a copy via the JPC to all members. Mr. Chow stated that SCE is interested in the pedestrian control programs of fellow members if a program is or is not required.

Mr. Wolfe read the document to those members teleconferencing. This item will remain within the ad hoc for further discussion.

JPA Final Draft – SCE

Mr. Chow stated that SCE would like to insert a box in the upper right hand corner of the SCE JPA Form 2 final (see last attachment). He presented a copy to the members. This box would be for SCE use only. This box would aid SCE staff with their accounting data. It was agreed that this minor revision to the SCE Form 2 would be placed on the JPA Alert page on the SCJPC.net webpage.

Unknown Items:

Alternative Pole Costs

Mr. Hunter stated that the DWP submitted a JPA for a 45 foot concrete pole. It that DWP did not submit costs for a 45 foot concrete pole, the cost reverted to that of a wood pole for that specific year. Mr. Hunter stated that although DWP did not have costs for concrete poles for that specific year, the cost should be that of the last year a cost was submitted for the alternative pole. In his opinion, the cost should revert to the last concrete cost submitted and not that of the current wood price.

Ms. Corella stated that the direction given to the JPC office is if a cost is not submitted for an alternative pole for that specific year, the cost of that alternative pole reverts to that of wood for that specific year.

Mr. Chow stated that the standard practice of the office is to revert to wood when no alternative to wood costs were submitted for that year. However, he added that reverting to the last time an alternative to wood cost was submitted is reasonable. He further added was how far back should the office research for a cost. A set time should be determined and documented. It was agreed to assign an item number to this issue. **Item 1521: Alternative Pole Costs when no cost submitted** has been assigned to the Routine Revision ad hoc committee.

E-All Pole JPA

Mr. Chow stated that his organization submitted a JPA with three poles where the last pole communication did not want interest in the pole, but the pole was noted on the JPA as E-All. The JPA was returned with a memo stating that the E-All pole should be changed to read communication down six. The communication did not want interest in the third pole. He added that SCE requires a no interest identifier for record purposes. He further added that he believes this is a training issue. Ms. Pranata responded that this type JPA was new to the office, and the office allocates all space on a pole. Mr. Chow stated that he is aware that the senior billing staff has retired, and the current staff is not aware of this type JPA. He further stated for clarification that when the JPC staff receives this type JPA that there is no action for the E-All pole and that it is for record keeping purposes within SCE. Ms. Pranata responded that she will notate this; however, she would like to research the JPA in that the JPC staff does not change a JPA without direction from the initiator.

SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Routine Revision	03/08/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Authorized Costs	03/08/11	Following	Routine Revision
Computer Comm	03/08/11	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	03/16/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	03/16/11	Following	Administrative Board

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Chow adjourned the meeting at 12:15 p.m., until March 16, 2011.

Mr. Robert Wolfe, President.

Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operations

ATTACHMENT I



January 31, 2011

Ms. Jennie Corella
Southern California Joint Pole Committee
1400 Montefino Avenue
Suite 100
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

RECEIVED
FEB 03 2011

Re: Public Wireless, Inc. Membership Application

Dear Ms. Corella:

Public Wireless formally requests the requirements to apply for membership to the Southern California Joint Pole Committee. Please send the application submittal requirements to the address below:

Public Wireless
Attn: Jennifer Haas
25 East Trimble Road
San Jose, CA 95131
(408) 433-3800 x 323
jhaas@publicwireless.com

Public Wireless is an alternative solutions provider for the wireless industry. We build small telecommunication facilities for all major carriers to improve wireless coverage and capacity. Public Wireless specializes in small scale solutions including femtocell, picocell and DAS network deployments. Public Wireless does not provide wireless telephone service directly to consumers and is considered a carrier's carrier. Public Wireless works on an individual case basis providing custom solutions for specific areas with coverage needs.

To date, Public Wireless has built sites located on private property or attached to infrastructure provided through partnerships with cable providers. Public Wireless is currently interested in joining the SCJPC to be able to directly access joint poles in the Southern California region.

Please contact me if you need further information at this time. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Haas".

Jennifer Haas
Regulatory Manager
(408) 433-3800 x 323

25 East Trimble Road
San Jose, CA 95131

ATTACHMENT II

18.6 Form 44 - Bill of Sale

Bill of Sale specified that sales shall be made subject to mortgages, deeds of trust, or other prior liens upon the property specified therein. The Form is prepared by the Committee office in accordance with Form 2 Final and specifies:

- the Members involved in billing
- the Authorization number
- the total amount to be billed on each Joint Pole Authorization
- The net amount due one company from the other.

The Bill of Sale form transfers equities between companies. One copy of every Bill of Sale must be executed by each company involved and transmitted to the other, regardless of which company pays the net bill.

SCJPC balances each account of the Final Bills processed during the month.
Account Codes are listed on page 20-6 (Section 20.5) (Will be in JPA Basic Training Power Point)

JPC sends the Forms 44 to each member involved.

- The member due money, must issue an invoice for remittance.
 - Attached signed Form 44 with the invoice
- The member owing money waits for the invoice from the other member.
 - Attach signed Form 44 with remittance

Associated with the Form 44 are the final JPAs processed during that month.

Each member should review the Final JPAs and Forms 44 for accuracy.

If correction(s) is/are required:

- Contact the initiating member and request a correction of records.
- If you are the initiating member, issue a correction of records.
- If the correction is required due to JPC, request JPC to issue a correction of records.

Form 44 must be invoiced as received, even if a correction is required. When the correction of records is processed, the monies will be rectified. As a member of the SCJPC, you are responsible for invoicing/payment of all Form 44s. See Example 19.

SCE PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC CONTROL

When is Pedestrian Traffic Control required?

Where the SCE construction/work site encroaches on public right of way and reduces the existing pedestrian path of travel to less than 48” wide and the crew will require more than 2 hours to complete their work.

When is Pedestrian Traffic Control not required?

On Construction sites where:

1. Inspection, construction or routine maintenance of electric facilities is being performed in 2 hours or less.
2. SCE did not originate the construction work and SCE does not encroach in the public right of way.
3. SCE is not responsible for the permitting of the final construction site and SCE work does not encroach in the public right of way.
4. The Troubleshooter or crew is involved in an emergency response situation. This would typically be at the first response stage. Once repair work begins the PTC requirements must be met if the job will require more than 2 hours of crew work.
5. The area is not improved (e.g. no sidewalks, not a marked/dedicated pedestrian right of way, not paved. Ect.)

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

1400 Montefino Ave. Suite 100
Diamond Bar, CA 91765
Phone (909) 348-5920
Fax (909) 348-5925

March 16, 2011

*****Revised*****

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

Mr. James Eastwood	Southern California Edison
Mr. Charles Johnson	Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Tony Mai	City of Anaheim
Mr. Gary Clark	City of Banning (teleconference)
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc (teleconference)
Mr. Joe Armstrong	City of Pasadena
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Comm./Local Serv.
Mr. Lawrence Yao	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Mr. Daniel Lippert	City of Burbank
Mr. Dan Kjar	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Mr. Mark Denning	M-Power/TelePacific (teleconference)
Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks (teleconference)
Ms. Kourtney Aboudara	NextG Networks
Mr. Charles Johnson	MCI Comm/MCI Metro (teleconference)
Ms. Shawn Henderson	AT&T Mobility
Ms. Alicia Smith	Spr-Nextel/Spr. Comm.(teleconference)
Mr. Annetta Baker	City of Colton (teleconference)
Ms. Maryan Farajzadeh	City of Vernon (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Ennis	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Larry Thorne	NewPath Networks (teleconference)
Mr. Larry Thorne	CA CLEC, LLC (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Jernnie Corella	Committee Staff

CALL TO ORDER:

Due to technical problems, Committee president Mr. Wolfe was not able to call the meeting to order as scheduled at 9:00 am. He apologized to the attendees for

the delay. When the problem was resolved, Mr. Wolfe called the meeting to order at 9:30 am. He then proceeded with the roll call by member utility, requesting that the representatives respond with their name, and the utility they are representing. When roll call was completed, those members recorded not in attendance are *City of Glendale, Golden State Water, ATC Outdoor DAS, and Time Warner Cable.*

HOUSEKEEPING:

Mr. Wolfe requested that member's who are teleconferencing mute their phones so that no interference is picked up. He added that if the teleconferencing members must step away from the meeting to please inform the chair when they leave and return to the meeting, in the event that a vote call transpired in their absence.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Wolfe inquired if the members had the opportunity to review the *February 16, 2011* Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. When reviewing was complete, Mr. Armstrong motioned to accept the February 16, 2011 minutes as written. Ms. Prescott seconded the motion. At the completion of tallying the votes, the motion carried unanimously.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Ms. Corella reported that the February 2011 operating expenses are \$47,684.46. This expense is approximately average. The members were assessed the total operating expenses for the month.

COMMUNICATIONS:

Public Wireless

Ms. Corella reported that she has received communication from Public Wireless in response to their interest in membership letter. She reported that Public Wireless has decided not to apply for committee membership at this time.

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 on March 8, 2011. He reported that in reference to hardscape/landscape restoration it was agreed that an estimate is to be attached to the preliminary Form 2 for approval by all members. He concluded by directing members to the review the minutes of the meeting available on the SCJCP.net website.

Operating Committee

Mr. Walls reported that the operating committee met on February 16, 2011. He reported that the members reviewed the monthly items. A primary topic of discussion is *Item 1509: Performance Appraisal & Salary Treatment*, which will be the main focus of the operating meeting scheduled for this afternoon. He stated that the minutes from this meeting are also available for review on the SCJPC.net website.

Routine Revision Committee

Ms. Hernandez reported that the ad hoc committee met on March 8, 2011. She announced that the 2011 Routine and Authorized Costs handbook is now available on the SCJPC.net website. She further reported that *Item 1514: Form 48 Final Bill Timeframe* was revised and is on the discussion calendar of the current agenda. In regards to alternative to wood pole prices, if a member failed to submit costs for this type poles; but had in the past, then the last costs that were submitted by that member should be used and not default to the current wood costs. Lastly, she stated that the members agreed to the elimination of sales tax on salvage poles, in that it is not mentioned in the Routine and the committee accountant's opinion is that this is not a sale in the true sense. She then recommended that members review the minutes from the meeting that are now available on the SCJPC.net website.

Computer Communications ad hoc Committee

Mr. Eastwood reported that this ad hoc committee met on March 8, 2011. He stated that Mr. Chow continues to review and navigate the iPAM link provided by Hyperlink. He recommended that members review the minutes for further details.

Pole Loading ad hoc Committee

Ms. Haney reported that the ad hoc did not meet this month, but would meet when deemed necessary.

Mr. Wolfe commented on working with OsMose and the OCALC-PRO programmers. He stated that the application is being enhanced and AT&T California will attempt to contact the power utilities to identify the most common wire pair gauges and their names to be implemented into the application. The objective is to customize the OCALC software for better functionality. Mr. Walls commented that DWP will also implement this software. DWP will be building their library, and Mr. Walls offered to export their library to those members who request it. Mr. Lippert added that the City of Burbank would also be utilizing OCALC for the incoming fiscal year.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Item 1513: City of Santa Monica Application.

There were no comments or issues. Mr. Wolfe solicited a motion to accept the consent calendar. Mr. Lippert motioned to accept the City of Santa Monica application. Mr. Ennis seconded the motion. Mr. Wolfe then tallied the votes which upon completion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION CALENDAR:

Item 1514: Form 48 Final Bill Timeframe – Proposed Revision to Section 18.2.

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion by stating that currently, if a member initiator has a JPA that has been signature approved by all parties on the JPA and there is no change, the JPA can be finalized when the Form 48 is issued. However, after discussion within the ad hoc committee is has been discovered that Forms 48 are being issued, and the work has not been completed in the way the JPA was originally written. Therefore, the ad hoc is proposing a change that when the Form 48 is issued, regardless of having all approved signatures, the 45 day period must be exhausted prior to finalizing the JPA, with the one exception of plant damage section 7.6. She then opened this item for any discussion.

Mr. Wolfe stated that in support of this proposal he is confident that this could ensure that the work and all necessary accounting are complete when the JPA is finalized. He added that AT&T California would like everything in synch when the JPA is submitted for final billing.

The members reviewed the revision to Section 18.2 (see attachment). Mr. Wolfe solicited a motion to accept the revision to Section 18.2. Ms. Hernandez

motioned to accept the revision to Section 18.2, Ms. Prescott seconded the motion. After the votes were tallied, the motion carried.

Ms. Hernandez commented in that the revision has been approved, she stated that the JPC office would not be aware of the time the Form 48 was issued unless it is noted on the Final JPA. Currently, the only requirement for noting the Form 48 date sent is when the JPA is approved via Section 18.1. Therefore, moving forward, all JPAs will require the Form 48 date sent noted on the Form 2 final.

Ms. Haney suggested revising the Final Form 2 to include a field to note Form 48 date sent. Ms. Hernandez stated that this could be placed on the Form 2 available on the website; however, there are those members who have the Form implemented in the software.

Ms. Corella would be sending out an email to all representatives in regards to notating Form 48 date sent on all Final Form 2 JPAs. Mr. Levy would revise the Form 2 by creating a field to notate the Form 48 date sent.

OTHER ITEMS: Unfinished Business

- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS (03/14/07)
- Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement - ROUTINE REVISION (09/17/08)
- Item 1495: Pole Inspections - ROUTINE REVISION (10/13/09)
- Item 1503: Create FTP for Pole Loading - COMPUTER COMM (04/13/10)
- Item 1508: Clarification of JPC Responsibilities - ROUTINE REVISION (07/13/10)
- Item 1509: Perform & Sal Treat Proc & Doc - OPERATING CTTE (07/21/10)
- Item 1512: Oper Guidelines/Proc for OM - OPERATING CTTE (08/18/10)
- Item 1513: City of Santa Monica Application - OPERATING CTTE (08/18/10)
- Item 1514: Form 48 Final Bill Timeframe - ROUTINE REVISION (09/19/10)
- Item 1516: Form 48 Simplification - ROUTINE REVISION (11/09/10)
- Item 1520: Operating Expenses, Proport vs Equal - OPERATING CTTE (01/19/11)
- Item 1522: Pole Inspections Cycles - ROUTINE REVISION (03/09/11)

Item 1519: *Environmental Issues*

This is a standing item.

New Business

Known Items:

There are no known items to report

Unknown Items:

Relocation of pole class field on the Final Form 2 – City of Los Angeles.

Mr. Walls suggested moving the pole class from the pole treatment column to the pole length column. After brief discussion it was agreed to discuss this at the ad hoc level. This will be discussed at the next Routine Revision ad hoc committee meeting.

Modification of antenna on existing site – AT&T Local Services.

Ms. Hernandez reported that the wireless utilities are upgrading their antennas and occasionally initiation of a JPA is required. She added that with a new site, a drawing is sent with the JPA, however, if the site is modified and a JPA is initiated, she inquired of the members if there is still the need of a drawing. Mr. Wolfe responded that in his opinion, once a member has constructed facilities on the pole, they have the right to modify without the need of a drawing. Mr. Ennis agreed with Mr. Wolfe and stated that if he as a wireless member is switching antennas and there is enough room for a larger antenna, and due to Rule 94 can perform self wind-loading to ensure safety; in his opinion there is no need to include a drawing with the JPA. After discussion it was agreed that no drawings are necessary on modifications.

Equipment placed on poles by private parties – AT&T California

Mr. Wolfe opened discussion on unauthorized attachment versus illegal attachment. He added that he has viewed poles utilized by private parties for clothes lines, trellis and support for structures. He added that he is now noticing private parties placing cameras on poles. He added that when these private parties are informed to remove the cameras, he is getting pushback from the private party stating that the pole is an easement on their property, therefore, has the right to place a camera on the pole. He inquired how members are handling this situation.

Mr. Eastwood responded that there is a law regarding trespassing. He added that if the mention of legal action gains no response from the party, then the county sheriff's department should be contacted in that this is trespassing. He further added that there is a concern for liability responsibility. He stated that SCE experiences private parties placing antennas for their respective satellite TV's on SCE poles.

Mr. Wolfe wished to ascertain if other members take this type action from private parties as a serious concern. The members responded that they do have concern over this type action.

SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Routine Revision	04/12/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Authorized Costs	04/12/11	Following	Routine Revision
Computer Comm	04/12/11	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	04/20/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	04/20/11	Following	Administrative Board

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Chow adjourned the meeting at 11:15 a.m., until April 20, 2011.

Mr. Robert Wolfe, President.

Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operations

ATTACHMENT I

Revision to Section 18.2

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.~~ **Exception section 7.6 can be final billed less than 45 days (Revised January 2012).**

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

1400 Montefino Ave. Suite 100

Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Phone (909) 348-5920

Fax (909) 348-5925

April 20, 2011

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

Mr. James Eastwood	Southern California Edison
Mr. Charles Johnson	Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California
Ms. Janet Chirrick	AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Scott Hunter	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless (teleconference)
Mr. Tony Mai	City of Anaheim
Mr. Jaime Reyes	City of Glendale
Mr. Gary Clark	City of Banning (teleconference)
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc
Mr. Dough Schmaderer	City of Pasadena (teleconference)
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Comm./Local Serv.
Mr. Lawrence Yao	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Mr. Daniel Lippert	City of Burbank
Mr. Dan Kjar	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Mr. Mark Denning	M-Power/TelePacific (teleconference)
Mr. Mayo Jenkins	Golden State Water (teleconference)
Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Ms. Debbie Wooten	NextG Networks
Mr. Charles Johnson	MCI Comm/MCI Metro (teleconference)
Ms. Shawn Henderson	AT&T Mobility
Ms. Alicia Smith	Spr-Nextel/Spr. Comm.(teleconference)
Mr. Annetta Baker	City of Colton (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Ennis	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Randall Starkey	Time Warner Cable (teleconference)
Mr. Larry Thorne	NewPath/CA CLEC(teleconference)
Mr. David Callender	ATC Outdoor DAS (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Jernnie Corella	Committee Staff

CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. Wolfe opened the meeting at 9:05 am and addressed the housekeeping issues. He then proceeded to take roll call. When roll call was complete those not in attendance are ExTeNet Systems and the City of Vernon.

HOUSEKEEPING:

Mr. Wolfe requested that member's who are teleconferencing mute their phones so that no interference is picked up. He added that if the teleconferencing members must step away from the meeting to please inform the chair when they leave and return to the meeting, in the event that a vote call transpired in their absence.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Wolfe inquired if the members had the opportunity to review the *March 16, 2011* Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. Mr. Wolfe requested a revision on page 6 in unknown items. The correction was noted and the minutes will be revised. When reviewing was complete, Ms. Haney motioned to accept the March 16, 2011 minutes as revised. Mr. Hunter seconded the motion. At the completion of tallying the votes, the motion carried unanimously.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Ms. Corella reported that the March 2011 operating expenses are \$45,804.50. This expense is approximately average. The members were assessed the total operating expenses for the month.

COMMUNICATIONS:

City of Santa Monica

Ms. Corella reported that the City of Santa Monica which was recently approved for membership by the Board members has yet to submit their initial membership payment fee. She added that until the funds are received, the new member is not allowed to process work. She further added that she would inform the members when the funds are remitted to the SCJPC.

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 April 12, 2011. He reported that **Item 1524: Re-inspection of Reinforced Poles** has been assigned to this ad hoc committee and directed members to review the minutes available on the SCJPC.net website.

Operating Committee

Mr. Hunter reported that the operating committee met on March 16, 2011. He reported that the major issue at this time within the committee is the staff evaluations and salary action. He added that the committee would be discussing this item at the next meeting.

Routine Revision Committee

Ms. Hernandez reported that the ad hoc committee met on April 12, 2011. She stated that the committee is reviewing for simplification the Form 48 for user friendliness and better alignment with current operations. She added that any suggestions for modification to this form are welcome. Ms. Hernandez then proceeded to demonstrate the modifications and their improvements. The members briefly discussed further modifications which will be expanded at the next ad hoc committee meeting. Lastly, she stated that the form would become available in both portrait and landscape formats.

She further reported that the ad hoc committee discussed inspection cycles and revisions have been proposed to sections in the Routine. These revisions are on the discussion calendar of today's meeting.

She reported that the members also discussed situations of how wireless members could finalize a JPA to purchase, even if the work is not complete. The space is purchased so an antenna could be set, but to be placed at a later date. The antenna owner would need to purchase the additional two-feet of safely clearance. If the original JPA does not reflect the SCZ purchase, then a Form 7 must be issued for the 2-feet of SCZ to ensure that the antenna is in compliance with Rule 94.

She concluded by directing members to review the minutes available on the SCJPC.net website.

Computer Communications ad hoc Committee

Mr. Eastwood reported that this ad hoc committee met on April 12, 2011. He reported that Mr. Chow emailed the iPAM application link to ad hoc committee members to test and/or review. He added that the multiple pole search report application is now available on the SCJPC.net web page. He further reported that he has heard very positive input in regards to the functionality of the report software. He closed by directing the members to the minutes for further details.

Pole Loading ad hoc Committee

Ms. Haney reported that the ad hoc did not meet this month, but would meet when deemed necessary.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

There are no items for consent.

DISCUSSION CALENDAR:

Item 1522: Pole Inspection Cycles

Ms. Hernandez reported that the Routine Revision ad hoc committee agreed that inspections could be billed once every five years. To this, the ad hoc committee has agreed on some revisions to the Routine. Those sections revised are 19.5, and 2.7-H. A note was added to authorized cost item 12. Mr. Wolfe inquired if these revisions apply to wood poles only. Ms. Hernandez responded that this is applicable to all type pole inspections. The date would be predicated on the date sent. She then opened these proposed revisions to discussion.

There was no discussion on these proposals, therefore; Ms. Hernandez motioned to approve the proposed revisions to the Routine Handbook. Mr. Hunter seconded the motion.

Mr. Wolfe took the votes, and when they were tallied the motion carried. It was agreed that the effective date would be May 2011.

OTHER ITEMS: Unfinished Business

Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS (03/14/07)

Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement - ROUTINE REVISION (09/17/08)

Item 1495: Pole Inspections - ROUTINE REVISION (10/13/09)

Item 1503: Create FTP for Pole Loading - COMPUTER COMM (04/13/10)

Item 1508: Clarification of JPC Responsibilities - ROUTINE REVISION (07/13/10)
Item 1509: Perform & Sal Treat Proc & Doc - OPERATING CTTE (07/21/10)
Item 1512: Oper Guidelines/Proc for OM - OPERATING CTTE (08/18/10)
Item 1516: Form 48 Simplification - ROUTINE REVISION (11/09/10)
Item 1520: Operating Expenses, Proport vs Equal - OPERATING CTTE (01/19/11)
Item 1522: Pole Inspections Cycles - ROUTINE REVISION (03/09/11)
Item 1523: Anchor Type Id – POLE LOADING/INSPECTIONS (06/16/2011)
Item 1524: Re-Inspection of Reinforced Poles – AUTHORIZED COSTS (04/12/2011)

Mr. Hunter inquired about **Item 1495: Pole Inspections**. This concerns the process of how members are to exchange pole loading calcs amongst themselves. Ms. Hernandez stated that this item is open contingent on the outcome of the Rules Committee. Mr. Hunter inquired if this item could be closed at this time and a new item number assigned when the results of the Rules Committee are known.

Ms. Hernandez responded that when the CPSD reviews the minutes, it is notated within the minutes, and this reflects that the SCJPC is proactive in regards to pole loading.

Ms. Wolfe inquired if the CPSD has access to the minutes. Ms. Hernandez responded that they gain access through members when members are requested to provide minutes to the CPSD.

After brief discussion it was agreed that this item remain open at this time.

Mr. Wolfe inquired into **Item 1523: Anchor Type Identification**. He stated that he is getting finals rejected that do not identify the anchor. He inquired if this item should remain open since the process of identifying anchors is in place. He added that there are instances where he deduces the type of anchor to get the JPA finalized. He further added that in many instances he defaults to the expansion anchor in that it was the most costly which could result in an overstatement, which is his objective to overstate and ensure the costs are close to accurate. He reiterated his question of closing this item.

Ms. Hernandez stated that she would like to discuss this issue further at the ad hoc level. This item would remain open for further discussion with the Pole Loading ad hoc committee.

Item 1519: *Environmental Issues*

This is a standing item.

New Business

Known Items:

Solely Owned Pole Database – AT&T California.

Mr. Wolfe stated that initially he was not suggesting a separate database for solely owned poles, but to input solely owned poles into the current database.

Ms. Haney stated that after discussion at the ad hoc level, it was determined that if solely owned poles were input into the current joint pole database that it would create a very large database that would result in slowing down the performance of the joint pole database.

After brief discussion it was agreed that a solely owned pole database could have value to the SCJPC. Therefore, **Item 1525: Solely Owned Poles Database** has been assigned to the Computer Communications ad hoc committee.

Tenant Grade on Proposed section of Form 2 – SCE

Mr. Eastwood opened discussion by stating that his organization is receiving JPAs returned from the JPC office for missing tenant grade. He added that these JPAs are older and being finalized by SCE via section 18.1-F, and in most instances tenant information is available and/or unattainable. He added that proposed at the Routine ad hoc committee is that all members are responsible for identify the grade of their tenants for record purposes. He further added that JPAs lacking tenant grade would be processed, however, the subsequent time the pole is addressed, it is the responsibility of the tenant owner to correct it by notating tenant grade.

Mr. Wolfe questioned why does the tenant grade require identification if the tenant is in the owning entities space. Mr. Wolfe inquired if this is noted in the handbook. Ms. Hernandez responded that it is a JPA alert, and was decided at the ad hoc level that an owner's tenant grade should be on record.

The initiator of a JPA could provide the tenant space, whatever member the tenant is in lease agreement with, because the initiator when doing their field work has the opportunity to identify the tenant grade at this time when visiting the site.

After discussion it was agreed that the JPC office would process JPAs with or without the tenant grade of attachment.

Request for Pole Loading Information - NextG

Ms. Haney stated that prior she sent notice to all members that NextG would be requesting the loading information, just as SCE does today. She added that to date her organization has not received any loading information from fellow members on incoming JPAs. She further added that she would be sending a second notice to members in reference to the NextG request for loading information on JPAs. This

notice would state that NextG would not accept JPAs without the loading information.

Mr. Eastwood responded that he is not certain if the actual loading sheets would be sent to NextG. Ms. Haney responded that she would ascertain the format of the loading information which NextG is requesting.

Mr. Hunter inquired if a JPA can be denied if there is no pole loading information included.

Ms. Hernandez stated that in her opinion a JPA cannot be denied for lack of pole loading information, but members do have the right to request and expect this information.

Mr. Wolfe responded that the exchange of pole loading information is coming, and responding to NextG's request would aid in preparation.

The members discussed, exchanged information and expressed their concerns in regards to this NextG request.

Unknown Items:

JPC Office Final JPA Example Manual

Mr. Eastwood requested a copy of the JPC office's *Final JPA Example Manual* that is maintained by the supervisor. The objective is to share this information within the SCE staff to aid with final JPAs submitted to the JPC office.

Ms. Hernandez stated that this is an Operating committee issue, and should be discussed at the ad hoc level. It was agreed to discuss this issue at the next Operating meeting.

SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Routine Revision	05/10/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Authorized Costs	05/10/11	Following	Routine Revision
Computer Comm	05/10/11	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	05/18/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	05/18/11	Following	Administrative Board

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Chow adjourned the meeting at 12:15 p.m., until May 18, 2011.

Mr. Robert Wolfe, President.

Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operations

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

1400 Montefino Ave. Suite 100

Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Phone (909) 348-5920

Fax (909) 348-5925

May 18, 2011

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

Mr. James Eastwood	Southern California Edison
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Mr. Charles Johnson	Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California
Ms. Janet Chirrick	AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Scott Hunter	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Alvin M. Aska	City of Anaheim
Mr. Varghese George	City of Glendale
Mr. Gary Clark	City of Banning (teleconference)
Mr. Doug Schmaderer	City of Pasadena
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Comm./Local Serv.
Mr. Lawrence Yao	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Mr. Dan Kjar	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Mark Denning	M-Power/TelePacific (teleconference)
Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Mr. Charles Johnson	MCI Comm/MCI Metro (teleconference)
Ms. Shawn Henderson	AT&T Mobility
Ms. Alicia Smith	Spr-Nextel/Spr. Comm.(teleconference)
Mr. Annetta Baker	City of Colton (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Ennis	T-Mobile USA
Mr. David Callender	ATC Outdoor DAS (teleconference)
Mr. Daryl Webster	ExTeNet Systems (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Jernnie Corella	Committee Staff

CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. Wolfe opened the meeting at 9:10 am. He then proceeded to take roll call. When roll call was complete those not in attendance are the City of Burbank,

Golden State Water, Time Warner Cable, the City of Lompoc, the City of Vernon, XO Communications, NewPath Networks, and CA CLEC, LLC.

HOUSEKEEPING:

Mr. Wolfe requested that member's who are teleconferencing mute their phones so that no interference is picked up. He added that if the teleconferencing members must step away from the meeting to please inform the chair when they leave and return to the meeting, in the event that a vote call transpired in their absence.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Wolfe inquired if the members had the opportunity to review the *April 20, 2011* Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. When reviewing was complete, Mr. Wolfe solicited a motion to accept the April 20, 2011 minutes as written. Mr. Chow moved to accept the minutes as written. Ms. Hernandez seconded the motion. At the completion of tallying the votes, the motion carried unanimously.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Ms. Corella reported that the April 2011 operating expenses are \$50, 908.34. This expense is slightly above average. This is due to payment of the business insurance, which is a prorated budgeted operating expense line item. The additional excess amount is attributed to the software purchase of the Multiple Pole Search Report. Ms. Corella added that this software is a tool available to members via the SCJPC.net website. The software allows two criteria type of pole searching. She further added that those members who have availed themselves of this tool have responded with positive input. She prompted members to visit the site and try this new application. Ms. Corella concluded by stating that members were assessed the total operating expenses for the month of April.

COMMUNICATIONS:

Frontier Communications

Ms. Corella reported that she received a letter from Frontier Communications stating their interest in committee membership. She then proceeded to read the notification to members (see attachment I). Mr. George questioned if Frontier was acquiring all Verizon California operations. Mr. Wolfe responded that it appears

only partial operations within those areas quoted in the communication. Ms. Corella concluded by stating that she has responded to the correspondence received from Frontier Communications informing them of the steps for commencing the application process.

Time Warner Cable – Change in Representative

Ms. Corella read a brief statement she received from Mr. Randall Starkey of Time Warner via email. In his statement, Mr. Starkey requested that Mr. Mike Zornes be removed as representative for Time Warner, and replaced by Mr. Tom Scanlan. She added that she was informed by Mr. Starkey that Mr. Zornes is no longer with us. She further added that Mr. Zornes passed away this past February. The website will be updated with the correct Time Warner Cable representative.

Hyperlink – iPAM

Ms. Corella reported that the Computer Communications ad hoc committee is moving forward with the testing of iPAM. She stated that Ms. Pranata informed Hyperlink that the committee would commence iPAM testing. She read the email message she received from Hyperlink. The message states that Hyperlink is pleased to hear that the committee will be testing the software and offered his assistance. He notified the committee that Hyperlink would make the software application and database available until June 30th. Ms. Corella stated that the application and database has been on his server for five years at no cost to the committee waiting for the completion of any testing. To this Ms. Corella added that it appears Hyperlink would like a response from the committee on the path forward for iPAM. She concluded by stating that the ad hoc committee would be testing and discussing the capabilities of the software.

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 Tuesday, May 10th. He added that **Item 1524: Re-Inspection of Reinforced Poles** was discussed, and an additional cost is being proposed and is on the discussion calendar of today's Board meeting. He suggested members read the minutes of the meeting for any details.

Operating Committee

Mr. Hunter reported that the operating committee met on April 20, 2011. The members reviewed the monthly standing agenda items. He added that the proposed salary action for the JPC staff was reviewed, discussed and approved to become effective June 2011. The manager's evaluation remains to be addressed, and would be prior to June 1, 2011. He directed the members to review the minutes of the meeting for further details.

Routine Revision Committee

Ms. Hernandez reported that the ad hoc committee met on Tuesday, May 10th. She further reported that the mission statement on the SCJPC.net home page has been revised for clarification between the SCJPC membership and the JPC office staff and their duties.

The members revised the Form 48 for efficiency, and the first form draft will be emailed to all members in PDF format for their review. She added that the members should have their field personnel review the document to gain their input on the document. She reminded all that it is merely a first draft, and not ready to be implemented at this time. The ad hoc committee is hoping to gain feedback from the members on the first draft.

Also, there is a JPA Alert in regards to section 16.2 (grade and space), and section 4, finalizing a JPA prior to construction. She recommended that members visit the web site for the latest JPA alerts and to alert their staff. She suggested members review the members for further details.

Computer Communications ad hoc Committee

Mr. Chow reported that this ad hoc committee met on May 10, 2011. He reported that all details in regards to the Multiple Pole Search application was finalized, and reiterated that this tool is available on the SCJPC web site.

He announced that after the Operating committee meeting to follow, the Computer Communications committee members will perform an initial test on the iPAM software. He added that Hyperlink has provided a quick user's guide, which should aid the members in refreshing their memories in that it has been some time since the members navigated the application. For further details, Mr. Chow suggested members review the minutes of the meeting.

Pole Loading ad hoc Committee

Ms. Haney reported that the ad hoc did not meet this month, but would meet when deemed necessary.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

There are no items for consent.

DISCUSSION CALENDAR:

Item 1524: Re-inspection of Reinforced Poles

Mr. Chow opened discussion by stating that from the last Routine Revision ad hoc committee meeting, the question arose if there is any documentation that alludes to the re-inspection of reinforced poles in the inspection maintenance program documentation submitted by those members who have an approved inspection maintenance program in the Routine Handbook, section 2. He added that he has submitted the latest version of the SCE inspection maintenance program document to the JPC office, and it is now on file with the committee office.

Mr. Wolfe inquired if there would be a tag associated to this type inspection. Mr. Chow responded that there is no physical tag for this type inspection.

Ms. Schmaderer questioned if the inspection would be detailed or intrusive. Mr. Chow responded that specific for SCE this would be an intrusive inspection of poles that were steel stubbed or fiberglass wrapped. He added that the pole would either pass or fail, and would not be reinforced a second time. If the pole passes it would stand for another ten years, if it fails, it would be replaced.

After brief discussion on methods of addressing these type poles and this type inspection by different members, Ms. Hernandez motioned to accept the proposed authorized cost item 12-F as written. Mr. Hunter seconded the motion. After the votes were taken and tallied by Mr. Wolfe the motion passed unanimously. This cost becomes effective June 1, 2011.

OTHER ITEMS: Unfinished Business

- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS (03/14/07)
- Item 1495: Pole Inspections - ROUTINE REVISION (10/13/09)
- Item 1503: Create FTP for Pole Loading - COMPUTER COMM (04/13/10)
- Item 1512: Oper Guidelines/Proc for OM - OPERATING CTTE (08/18/10)
- Item 1516: Form 48 Simplification - ROUTINE REVISION (11/09/10)
- Item 1520: Operating Expenses, Proport vs Equal - OPERATING CTTE (01/19/11)
- Item 1523: Anchor Type Id – POLE LOADING/INSPECTIONS (06/16/2011)
- Item 1524: Re-Inspection of Reinforced Poles – AUTHORIZED COSTS (04/12/2011)
- Item 1525: Solely Owned Poles Database - COMPUTER COMM. (04/20/2011)

There was no discussion on the Unfinished Business section of the agenda.

Item 1519: *Environmental Issues*

This is a standing item.

New Business

Known Items:

There were no known items to discuss.

Unknown Items:

Southern California Gas Company

Mr. Hunter stated that the department was contacted by the Southern California Gas Company (the Gas Company) expressing an interest in committee membership. He inquired if the members have any concern with the Gas Company joining the committee.

Mr. Chow added that approximately one year ago, SCE was contacted by Siemper utilities to inquire issues in regards to pole ownership versus licensing. He added that they are preparing to place Smart Meters to monitor gas usage as SCE is in the process of restructuring their meters.

Mr. Hunter added that the box the Gas Company would be attaching is no greater than 2” by 2”, and would not be on every pole, but per specific ranges. He further added that within the City of Los Angeles it would be approximately 200 to 300 poles, with the Southern California area of approximately 4,000.

Mr. Wolfe stated that the Smart Boxes are proliferating in Northern California and added that it is a small rectangular box. He further added that those in the North are within the supporting structure of the pole. He further stated that there are no major issues in the North with the attached Smart Boxes.

Mr. Ennis inquired if the boxes in the North were metered or photocell generated. Mr. Wolfe responded that they were photocell.

Mr. Hunter stated that during discussion with the Gas Company, they stated that there are two options, one is photocell and the other is power. He added that photocell would probably not be allowable for the City of Los Angeles. Mr. Hunter concluded stating that he would keep the members posted.

Correction of Record JPA

Mr. Chow opened discussion on Correction of Records header information. He stated that per the Routine, the header information must be the same as the header information on the JPA being corrected. However, he added that per the

Routine, the correction of record JPA is not really a different JPA. He questioned how the member's differentiate between money being corrected and pole record corrections. Ms. Hernandez responded by Sections 13.1 and 13.2. She stated that 13.2 section title reads, "Refund", she added that perhaps at Routine, the members should discuss revising the section title to read correction of dollars.

Mr. Chow stated that due to the review period required, his staff is of the opinion that the correction of record JPA should be treated as a separate JPA to allow fellow members the allotted time required for review. Ms. Hernandez responded that the 45 day period does not change for a correction. Mr. Chow responded that the since the header info is the same as the original JPA, it impacts the time period.

Ms. Hernandez responded that when the JPA is signed with the date mailed, and she receives the corrected JPA she is aware that she has 45 days from the date mailed.

After brief discussion, it was agreed to further discuss this issue at the ad hoc level. **Item 1526: Review of Section 13.2** has been assigned to the Routine Revision ad hoc committee for further review.

Approved Maintenance Inspection Program

Mr. George reported that he would like to present the City of Glendale's inspection maintenance program to be included in section 2 of the Routine Handbook. He inquired into the process.

Mr. Chow responded that the maintenance program must be approved by the Board prior to documenting the approval in the handbook. Once, the maintenance program is approved and documented in the handbook, then the approved member may commence billing fellow member's maintenance inspection costs.

Mr. George inquired that once the program is presented and approved, does the approval remain in the handbook with no other steps necessary.

Mr. Chow responded in the affirmative; however, if there are any changes and/or additions to the approved member's maintenance, then an updated maintenance inspection program documentation must be submitted to the JPC office to maintain on file. He added that he submitted the latest version of the inspection maintenance program documentation for SCE to the JPC office to maintain in their files. He further added that the inspection costs to be shared by members are authorized costs items 12-A through 12-F. These costs remain in effect for two years, in that authorized costs are reviewed every two years.

Mr. George would contact the JPC office when he is ready to present the inspection maintenance program for the City of Glendale to the Board members for their approval.

SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Routine Revision	06/14/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Authorized Costs	06/14/11	Following	Routine Revision
Computer Comm	06/14/11	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	06/15/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	06/15/11	Following	Administrative Board

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Chow adjourned the meeting at 10:30 a.m., until June 15, 2011.

Mr. Robert Wolfe, President.

Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operations

Attachment I



1800 41st St.
Everett, WA 98201
Mail Code:
WA0103NP

April 27, 2011

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
Attn: Jennie Corella
1400 Montefino Ave. #100
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

RE: Request To Join The SCJPC

Ms. Corella,

On May 13, 2009, Verizon and Frontier announced plans to spin off Verizon's local wire line operations serving residential and small business customers in 14 states to Frontier. Those states are Arizona, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Nevada, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. A small number of exchanges in California, including those bordering Arizona, Nevada, and Oregon, were also included. After receiving all necessary regulatory approvals, the transaction closed on July 1, 2010.

In Idaho, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin, West Virginia, the Verizon North Inc. portion of IL, and the Verizon West Coast Inc. portion of CA, the existing joint use licenses and agreements are transferred to Frontier by operation of law with the control of the capital stock of the various Verizon ILEC entities being transferred to Frontier. As such, no assignment or new agreement is necessary. The existing licenses and agreements remain in place.

Frontier has approximately 4,500 contacts on jointly used poles with Southern California Edison and possibly more that were not informed about from Verizon. Verizon had a SCJPC membership but I was informed that it is not transferable to a new company. We wish to establish a new membership under Frontier Communications.

There is work on the jointly used poles with SCE that is waiting on our membership. As of yesterday there are 21 poles that require our attention and SCE has asked about our status with the SCJPC. We want to get these issues resolved as soon as possible and provide SCE with an update.

Thank you,

David G. Seriguchi Jr.
Joint Use Specialist
Network Engineering & Planning
Pacific – CO/OSP Support
(425) 261-5335

Attachment II

AUTHORIZED COSTS								
POLE MAINTENANCE AND MISCELLANEOUS								
<u>ITEM</u>	30' & 35'	40' & 45'	50' & 55'	60' & 65'	70' & 75'	80' & 85'	90' & 95'	100'
1. Trenching or moving: (with supply)*	1727	2159	2447	3023	3743	4607	5398	5830
2. Trenching or moving: (without supply)*	674	722	802					
3. Lowering or raising to grade (one operation) :	995	1133	1277	1706	2179	2535	3886	3062
4. Straightening in earth*:	857	1247	1006	1163	1510	1772	1832	1868
5. Removing from service:								
(a) Pulling.....per pole								805
*includes 1 hour pre-planning and engineering								
(b) Transporting.....per pole								251
(c) Topping Pole.....								287
*based on topping and lowering.								
(d) Disposal.....per pole								172
*effective 07/01/02								
6. Pole Stubbing (stub-size):								
(a) 8 ft. metal truss.....								400
(b) 10 ft. metal truss.....								538
(c) 11 ft. metal truss.....								802
(d) 12 ft. metal truss.....								804
(e) 13 ft. metal truss.....								1385
(f) 14 ft. metal truss.....								2064
(g) 15.5 ft. metal truss.....								2388
(h) additional metal trusses (all sizes).....								254
(i) Inaccessible to stubbing equipment.....								61
7. Intentionally left blank								
8. Semi-circular pole guards:								
(a) Installation.....								135
(b) Transferring.....								118
9. Hand Dig/Hand Removal.....								864
(a) Inaccessible to digging equipment								
(b) Accessible with Conflict-Must specify nature of conflict								
(c) Pole removal not accessible to removal equipment								
10. Sidewalk or pavement repairs for placement, replacement, or removal of pole or anchor: (Permit and/or inspection fees, if any, are by special agreement) (See also JPR Section 19.6)								
(a) Cement break and temporary repair.....								514
(b) Asphalt break and repair.....								354
(c) Cement saw cut break and repair. Based on 25 square feet.....								723
11. Joint Rights of Way: (By special agreement)								
12. Pole Inspections and Treatment								
(a) Visual Inspection.....								34
(b) Partial Dig.....								40
(c) Sound and Bore.....								34
(d) Full Treatment.....								52
(e) Reject.....								33
Note: May only be billed once every 5 years. (Effective May 2011)								
(f) Re-inspection of reinforced poles (may only be billed once every 10 years, effective MM/DD/YYYY).....								53

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

1400 Montefino Ave. Suite 100
Diamond Bar, CA 91765
Phone (909) 348-5920

June 15, 2011

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

Mr. James Eastwood	Southern California Edison
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Mr. Charles Johnson	Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California
Mr. Jeff Wolf	AT&T California
Ms. Janet Chirrick	AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Scott Hunter	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Alvin M. Aska	City of Anaheim
Mr. Jaime Reyes	City of Glendale
Mr. Gary Clark	City of Banning (teleconference)
Mr. Daniel Lippert	City of Burbank (teleconference)
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc (teleconference)
Ms. Maryan Farajzadeh	City of Vernon (teleconference)
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Mr. Mayo Jenkins	Golden State Water (teleconference)
Mr. Randall Starkey	Time Warner Cable (teleconference)
Mr. Tom Scanlon	Time Warner Cable (teleconference)
Mr. Doug Schmaderer	City of Pasadena
Mr. Joe Armstrong	City of Pasadena
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Comm./Local Serv.
Mr. Lawrence Yao	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Mr. David Patterson	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Mark Denning	M-Power/TelePacific (teleconference)
Ms. Debbie Wooten	NextG Networks
Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Mr. Charles Johnson	MCI Comm/MCI Metro (teleconference)
Ms. Shawn Henderson	AT&T Mobility
Ms. Alicia Smith	Spr-Nextel/Spr. Comm.(teleconference)
Mr. Larry Thorne	CA CLEC/NewPath (teleconference)
Mr. Annetta Baker	City of Colton (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Ennis	T-Mobile USA
Mr. David Callender	ATC Outdoor DAS (teleconference)
Mr. Steve Garcia	ExTeNet Systems (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Jernnie Corella	Committee Staff

CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. Wolfe called the meeting to order at 9:06 am. He then proceeded to take roll call. When roll call was complete there was 100% member attendance.

HOUSEKEEPING:

Mr. Wolfe requested that member's who are teleconferencing mute their phones so that no interference is picked up. He added that if the teleconferencing members must step away from the meeting to please inform the chair when they leave and return to the meeting, in the event that a vote call transpired in their absence.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Wolfe inquired if the members had the opportunity to review the *May 18, 2011* Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. When reviewing was complete, Mr. Wolfe solicited a motion to accept the May 18, 2011 minutes as written. Ms. Haney moved to accept the minutes as written. Mr. Ennis seconded the motion. At the completion of tallying the votes, the motion carried unanimously.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Ms. Corella reported that the May 2011 operating expenses are \$47, 919.77. This is an average expensed month. The members were assessed this amount.

COMMUNICATIONS:

Property in Foreclosure: 1400 Montefino Ave. Diamond Bar

Ms. Corella reported that she received a notice that the property where the JPC office is leasing office space has gone into foreclosure. She stated that the property is in receivership with Cushman and Wakefield. The monthly lease expenses are sent to the entity assigned receivership. She further reported that she has signed a non-disturbance agreement which guarantees that the new owners must honor the original lease agreement terms. Therefore, it appears that the only possible future changes to the property would be the owners. There were no questions from the membership on this communication at this time.

Subpoena for Records

Ms. Corella reported that the JPC office has received a subpoena for records. She stated that the subpoena is in regards to case name: Crown Pointe Estates at Malibu vs. Butsko Utility Design. She added that Ms. Pranata researched and compiled all requested documents and this task was time and labor intensive. To this Ms. Corella inquired if a fee should be billed for this type of request. She further added that in the past when records were subpoenaed by a legal service, a check for \$15.00 was included. After brief discussion it was agreed to assign this issue to a sub-committee. **Item 1529: 3rd Party Research Rate for Documents** has been assigned to the Operating committee for discussion.

AT &T California Billing Office Relocated

Mr. Wolfe reported that the joint billing office for the south has been reassigned to Visalia under Ms. Janet Chirrick. He added that he would be working in tandem with Ms. Chirrick for the remainder of this year, since just recently two of his clerks took early retirement. Ms. Chirrick will take full responsibility at the beginning of next year, in that he (Mr. Wolfe) would be retiring. He further added that Ms. Chirrick has an extensive background in records, joint billing and administration. He concluded by stating that Ms. Chirrick would be an asset to the SCJPC.

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 in June due to time constraints.

Operating Committee

Mr. Hunter reported that the operating committee met on May 18, 2011. The committee reviewed the standing agenda items. He encouraged the members to review the minutes of the meeting posted on the SCJPC website for all details.

Routine Revision Committee

Ms. Hernandez reported that the ad hoc committee met on Tuesday, June 14, 2011. She stated that the committee extensively worked on the Form 48 draft which will be on the discussion calendar of the current meeting for review by all members. A new item has been added to the Routine handbook glossary, it is sidewalk guy. This change will be on the SCJPC JPA Alert webpage. SCE would be sending notice to all tenants that if they are not attached within the correct space to rearrange to the correct space, or apply for license to that member whose space they are occupying. It was suggested that a list of commonly known tenant contacts be uploaded and available to members via the SCJPC.net website. She requested that members inform their personnel to use the correct member code. She is receiving documents intended for AT&T California whose code is "H" and not ATT, which is the code for AT&T Communications. All member codes are available in Section 20 of the Routine handbook. She concluded by directing the members to review the meeting minutes available on the committee website.

Computer Communications ad hoc Committee

Mr. Chow reported that this ad hoc committee met on June 14, 2011. The primary focus of the meeting was discussion with Hyperlink in regards to iPAM. Some questions were posed to Mr. Atalla of Hyperlink. Hyperlink has been maintaining iPAM on Hyperlink's server without compensation or commitment. He added that the ad hoc committee is interested in the number of members that would fully commit to iPAM by a) the financial investment to complete the project, and b) implementing the software within their organization. Initially, the consensus was that all members would be assessed equally. Those members opting not to utilize the software and continue the manual process would be assessed a cost-causer fee, plus equal assessment for purchase or licensing of the software. He further reported that there are two options for the committee use of the software. One is to purchase it for \$375K, which is negotiable, and the committee would own the source code. The positive is that the software is the property of the committee, but there is the additional monthly cost of hosting, support and maintenance to Hyperlink or another entity. The second option is to license the software and pay a monthly fee of \$5K, \$2K would be the hosting and the balance would be the licensing. The license option would require a three-year commitment.

He further reported that the current pole database (FRIEND) would require conversion to the iPAM environment whatever option is agreed upon. The cost for the conversion would be \$75K.

Mr. Wolfe stated that iPAM appears to be a workable product and is the future. He added that the committee should arrive at a decision to accept iPAM and move forward or not.

Mr. Schmaderer inquired the members' opinion of the committee not owning the source code.

Mr. Chow responded that iPAM is a custom software, and in his opinion there are not too many other entities that this software would benefit, therefore, he sees no problem in not owning the source code.

Mr. Wolfe stated that taking the grand total of \$450K, which is the cost for ownership, and dividing it amongst 32 members the equal cost to each member would be approximately \$15K. However, the purchase cost is negotiable. Mr. Wolfe stated that some members have suggested viewing a full demonstration of the application in processing a JPA from start to finish.

Ms. Prescott stated that her organization has tested the software and in her opinion entering a JPA is fairly easy. She added there would be the learning curve of the different screens and navigating the application, but it is not a difficult application. She added that her group has entered different Routine sections.

The members discussed the several advantages of electronic JPAs, such as expedition of finalizing JPAs, JPAs processed in the correct sequential order, and iPAM populating the on record information correctly taken from the database eliminating typos.

The committee members viewed a sample iPAM screen and JPA that had been processed by Ms. Hernandez during the testing phase. It was noted that Mr. Atalla stated there is the ability of implementing a mapping system if needed.

In conclusion, Mr. Chow stated that iPAM appears to operate as expected and a path forward is to survey the entire membership to ascertain if they support iPAM financially and would utilize the application within their organization. The consensus is to create a survey sheet for the membership to complete, include the Quick Guide provided by Hyperlink and to request a 60-day extension from Hyperlink.

For further details, Mr. Chow suggested members review the minutes of the meeting.

Pole Loading ad hoc Committee

Ms. Haney reported that the ad hoc did not meet this month, but would meet when deemed necessary.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

There are no items for consent.

DISCUSSION CALENDAR:

Item 1516: Form 48 Simplification

Mr. Wolfe opened by stating that the Routine Revision ad hoc committee has committed many hours in creating the latest draft revision for the Form 48. The objective is to arrive at a greater user friendly form and one that is in line with today's standards of operation. Ms. Hernandez displayed the form and explained the deletions, and revisions to the form. She demonstrated how to complete the form in different specific scenarios. She added that once approved, the form would be designed and be available in landscape format for those who prefer it in this format. The consensus is to have the members thoroughly review the revised form, and it will be placed on the consent calendar of the July Board meeting for possible Board approval.

OTHER ITEMS: Unfinished Business

- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS (03/14/07)
- Item 1495: Pole Inspections - POLE LOADING/INSPECTIONS (10/13/09)
- Item 1503: Create FTP for Pole Loading - COMPUTER COMM (04/13/10)
- Item 1512: Oper Guidelines/Proc for OM - OPERATING CTTE (08/18/10)
- Item 1516: Form 48 Simplification - ROUTINE REVISION (11/09/10)
- Item 1520: Operating Expenses, Proport vs Equal - OPERATING CTTE (01/19/11)
- Item 1523: Anchor Type Id – POLE LOADING/INSPECTIONS (06/16/2011)
- Item 1525: Solely Owned Poles Database - COMPUTER COMM. (04/20/2011)
- Item 1526: Review of Section 13.2 - ROUTINE REVISION (05/18/11)
- Item 1527: Review Reason/Questions of JPA Error - OPERATING CTTE (05/18/11)

In regards to **Item 1503: Create FTP for Pole Loading**, Mr. Wolfe reported that the NCJPA has arrived at an authorized cost to pay another party to actually do the total load calculations on the pole. He presented a scenario where there is a complex power pole stating that he would contact the power member to handle the pole calculations and would pay the power member the approved authorized cost for the operation. He concluded that if this is something the SCJPC could benefit from, then it could be discussed at the ad hoc level with the possibility of creating a cost.

There was no further discussion on unfinished business.

Item 1519: *Environmental Issues*

This is a standing item.

New Business

Known Items:

There were no known items to discuss.

Unknown Items:

Web site access for government agencies

Mr. Chow opened discussion by stating there was previous discussion of creating a list of Known Tenants to be available on the SCJPC.net website. To this he inquired if the members would support making some pages on the website accessible to government agencies such as Cal-Trans allowing them to access information on pole ownership. Mr. Wolfe inquired if the members contact information should be available to these agencies as well. Mr. Chow responded that this information would be a great benefit to these agencies, and the access should be limited to specific information only. He added that this limited access should be controlled by the committee.

Ms. Prescott stated that rather than giving government agencies access to the website have the entities contact the JPC office and for a nominal fee they have the ability to get pole record information.

Mr. Chow stated that the above mentioned process is a good option for government agencies to obtain information, however, his concern is the impact it would have on JPC staff.

Ms. Pranata stated that if these entities provide an Excel file with the pole numbers in question the Multiple Pole Search application could be utilized.

It was agreed that this issue could be incorporated into **Item 1529: 3rd Party Research Rate for Documents and Records** assigned to the Operating committee.

Cost Causer for PG&E

Mr. Chow opened discussion by stating that PG&E is requesting the ability of a cost causer fee that would enable them to process transactions in the South without necessitating joining the committee. He stated that since PG&E did not sign the 1998 Agreement, they are not members and are not obligated to pay any monthly assessment fees. But, they would have no problem paying a cost causer when any pole work is processed.

Ms. Hernandez stated that historically PG&E was invoiced by the JPC office for poles processed. The invoices were not paid and it was the decision of the Operating committee to write them off. She added that the invoices were minimal, however, were written off the accounts receivable after months of attempting to collect payment.

Mr. Chow responded that he was unaware of this particular situation and that there was a change of personal within PG&E. After brief discussion among the members, Mr. Chow added that he would create a proposal for a cost causer for PG&E and present it to the necessary ad hoc committee for further review and discussion.

MP Poles incorrectly Tagged

Mr. Schmaderer opened discussion in regards to pole inspections. He reported that on a number of poles, the other owning entity inspected the poles and proceeded to renumber them. He added that the poles are joint with SCE, and SCE renumbered them with member code “M”. Mr. Schmaderer stated that M is not member to these poles. He further added that he believes the contractors were on the wrong street and mistakenly inspected and tagged the wrong poles.

Mr. Wolfe suggested paying the contractors that inspected the poles and remove the incorrect tags. This concern would handled be off line between those members involved as a quality control issue.

SCE/AT&T California External Affairs

Mr. Wolfe reported that Mr. David Ford of SCE external affairs was scheduled to attend the board meeting, as well as an AT&T California external affairs personnel. This is in reference to the County of Los Angeles and poles left in the field, and incomplete transfers. He added that AT&T California has created a process so the County will be aware of who is responsible for removing the pole from the field. He further added that for some unforeseen reasons, the AT&T California external affairs personnel were unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Chow stated that he contacted Mr. Ford with all the particulars of the meeting in that he could be present at the meeting. Mr. Chow added that SCE was not certain about the presentation, but would be prepared for the next board meeting, and make certain that they get on the agenda.

SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Routine Revision	07/12/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Authorized Costs	07/12/11	Following	Routine Revision
Computer Comm	07/12/11	Following	Authorized Costs
Operating Committee	07/12/11	Following	Computer Comm
Administrative Board	07/20/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Wolfe adjourned the meeting at 12:05 p.m., until July 20, 2011.

Mr. Robert Wolfe, President.

Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operations

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

1400 Montefino Ave. Suite 100
Diamond Bar, CA 91765
Phone (909) 348-5920

July 20, 2011

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

Mr. James Eastwood	Southern California Edison
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Mr. Charles Johnson	Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Brad Garner	City of Los Angeles (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Alvin M. Aska	City of Anaheim
Mr. Gary Clark	City of Banning (teleconference)
Mr. Daniel Lippert	City of Burbank
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc (teleconference)
Ms. Maryan Farajzadeh	City of Vernon (teleconference)
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Mr. Mayo Jenkins	Golden State Water (teleconference)
Mr. Randall Starkey	Time Warner Cable (teleconference)
Mr. Tom Scanlon	Time Warner Cable (teleconference)
Mr. Doug Schmaderer	City of Pasadena
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Comm./Local Serv.
Mr. Lawrence Yao	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Mr. Mark Denning	M-Power/TelePacific (teleconference)
Ms. Debbie Wooten	NextG Networks
Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Mr. Charles Johnson	MCI Comm/MCI Metro (teleconference)
Ms. Shawn Henderson	AT&T Mobility (teleconference)
Ms. Alicia Smith	Spr-Nextel/Spr. Comm.(teleconference)
Mr. Larry Thorne	CA CLEC/NewPath (teleconference)
Mr. Phillip Hinojos	City of Colton (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Ennis	T-Mobile USA
Mr. David Callender	ATC Outdoor DAS (teleconference)
Mr. Steve Garcia	ExTeNet Systems (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff

CALL TO ORDER:

In the absence of Mr. Wolfe, Mr. Chow chaired the meeting. He called the meeting to order at 9:06 am and proceeded to take roll call. When roll call was

completed those members not in attendance are AT&T California, the City of Azusa, and the City of Glendale.

HOUSEKEEPING:

Mr. Chow requested that member's who are teleconferencing mute their phones so that no interference is picked up. He added that if the teleconferencing members must step away from the meeting to please inform the chair when they leave and return to the meeting, in the event that a vote call transpired in their absence. He reported that Ms. Corella the office manager is out on illness due to a stroke. She is doing well and improving and should return by month's end. He thanked the Board and staff for the plant arrangement sent to Ms. Corella on behalf of the Board and staff.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Chow inquired if the members had the opportunity to review the *June 15, 2011* Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. Ms. Hernandez noted a typo. Ms. Pranata corrected the error. When reviewing was complete, Mr. Chow solicited a motion to accept the June 15, 2011 minutes as corrected. Ms. Haney moved to accept the minutes as corrected. Ms. Hernandez seconded the motion. At the completion of tallying the votes, the motion carried unanimously.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Ms. Pranata reported that the June 2011 operating expenses are \$45,985.52. This is an average expensed month. The members were assessed this amount.

COMMUNICATIONS:

Verizon California, MCI Metro, MC Telecomm – New Representative.

Ms. Pranata reported that she received an email message from Mr. Chuck Johnson naming the new rep for VZ, MCI, and ATS. The new representative is Tracy Province. Her information is included in the meeting packet.

Athens Services

Ms. Pranata reported that she received an email message from Athens Services of Redondo Beach requesting to have some wires raised to accommodate

their trucks. Ms. Pranata was instructed to forward this email message to Mr. Tom Scanlon of Time Warner.

City of Ontario – interest in membership

Ms. Pranata reported that she received an email from Mr. Jimmy Chang who is with the City of Ontario stating their interest in committee membership. Mr. Chow stated that the City of Ontario inquired into the boundaries that are covered by the SCJPC. He added that he responded to the city. His response was that the Western boundary is the Pacific Ocean, the Eastern boundary is the state line, the North is the boundary line for Kern County extended across the state, and as far South as the boundaries of San Diego and Imperial counties. He inquired if the members agreed with his description of the SCJPC boundaries. The members were in agreement.

SPECIAL REPORTS

There were no special reports

SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:

ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements

Mr. Chow reported that the ad hoc committee did meet the prior week. He directed the members to review the minutes of the meeting for details.

Operating Committee

Mr. Chow reported that the Operating committee met in June, and directed the members to review the minutes of this meeting.

Routine Revision Committee

Ms. Hernandez reported that the ad hoc committee met on Tuesday, July 12, 2011. She stated that the ad hoc committee members will review and test the newly revised Form 48. Mr. Chow added that SCE is creating the Form 48 in landscape format. The Form 48 will be available in portrait and landscape format.

Computer Communications ad hoc Committee

Mr. Chow reported that this ad hoc committee met on July 12, 2011. The ad hoc committee has completed a survey to be sent to the members to aid in determining the path forward for iPAM. The members also discussed the possibility of a solely owned database. This would allow members to research solely owned poles. He added that the suggestion of dumping the info from other databases into one common solely owned database would not be difficult. However, Mr. Chow stated that from an SCE perspective this would be difficult. Therefore, perhaps a database could be built moving forward. He further added that he would create a draft of fields for the members to review to ensure that all information necessary for the solely owned database is captured for the pole record. He concluded by suggesting the members refer to the minutes for further details.

Pole Loading ad hoc Committee

Ms. Haney reported that the ad hoc did not meet this month, but would meet when deemed necessary.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

There are no items for consent.

DISCUSSION CALENDAR:

There are no items for discussion.

OTHER ITEMS: Unfinished Business

- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS (03/14/07)
- Item 1495: Pole Inspections - POLE LOADING/INSPECTIONS (10/13/09)
- Item 1503: Create FTP for Pole Loading - COMPUTER COMM (04/13/10)
- Item 1512: Oper Guidelines/Proc for OM - OPERATING CTTE (08/18/10)
- Item 1516: Form 48 Simplification - ROUTINE REVISION (11/09/10)
- Item 1520: Operating Expenses, Proport vs Equal - OPERATING CTTE (01/19/11)
- Item 1523: Anchor Type Id – POLE LOADING/INSPECTIONS (06/16/2011)
- Item 1525: Solely Owned Poles Database - COMPUTER COMM. (04/20/2011)
- Item 1526: Review of Section 13.2 - ROUTINE REVISION (05/18/11)
- Item 1527: Review Reason/Questions of JPA Error - OPERATING CTTE (05/18/11)

There was no discussion on unfinished business.

Item 1519: *Environmental Issues*

This is a standing item.

New Business

Known Items:

There were no known items to discuss.

Unknown Items:

SCE Inspections for NG

Ms. Haney stated that her organization is receiving inspections from SCE stating that they are one or two inches off of what they specified where they intended to attach per the pole loading information. Ms. Haney inquired of Mr. Chow the method SCE utilizes to determine the height of attachment. Mr. Chow responded that he does not know, but would give Ms. Haney a contact name and number to answer her question. Mr. Eastwood responded that he believes they use a stick method.

Ms. Haney further stated that a majority of these inspections are within the correct space that NG has purchased. She added that whether a stick or a laser is used, the measurement is not always precise, and she reiterated that her organization is within the purchased space.

Mr. Chow and Mr. Eastwood assured Ms. Haney that if they could not determine the cause, they would put NG in contact with someone within SCE who could answer her questions.

WEI Conference

Mr. Eastwood announced that the WEI is being held this year in Long Beach on September 19th through 21st, and the organizers requested that he distribute the flyers for the conference. There is a soft copy which will be distributed to all Board members via email per Ms. Pranata

Pole Replacement Completion

Mr. Chow stated that he is aware that there is much outstanding work in regards to pole replacement. He added that SCE is not receiving the Form 48 that they should receive confirming that the other member has removed their facilities and PTD the pole. To this he requested that members upon returning to their organizations follow through to ensure that the process is completed and the Form 48 sent.

Work Performed with pole replacements

Mr. Chow stated that when setting a new pole, SCE sends a sketch to other members to notify them of the new pole location. He added that SCE is unable to identify the work which transpired by the other members involved. The Form 2 does indicate splicing, the size of the splice or the size of a cable. He inquired if members could provide SCE a work print to determine and verify the splicing charges and amount of cable. He further added that the objective is to determine what type of work was performed.

SCE Correction of Record

Mr. Chow stated that SCE finalized a JPA where the last page of the JPA did get typed up. He inquired if this could be processed as a correction of record. Ms. Hernandez stated that her office has omitted a page(s) in the past, and added that she sends a correction and adding a page. Mr. Chow stated that the correcting JPA will have a different number than the original JPA, but with the COR extension, and in the body of the text it will direct one to the original JPA.

PTD of re-poles

Mr. Chow opened discussion on re-poles. He stated that VZ is sending Form 7's changing the pulling routine. He added that SCE is denying the Form and would not return to the site to PTD the pull since the JPA was approved by VZ to PTD. He further added that some of these JPAs are three to four years old, and today VZ no longer PTD re-poles. He stated if SCE returns to the site, they will not do so for one half of the PTD charge. Moving forward SCE is able to identify a re-pole and the PTD would be worked out between SCE and VZ. However, those older JPAs are the issue. Mr. Chow concluded by stating he would contact and work with the newly assigned VZ rep, Ms. Tracey Province on this issue.

SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Routine Revision	08/09/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Authorized Costs	08/09/11	Following	Routine Revision
Computer Comm	08/09/11	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	08/17/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	08/17/11	Following	Administrative Board

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Chow adjourned the meeting at 10:05 a.m., until August 17, 2011.

Mr. Larry Chow, Chair

Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operations

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

1400 Montefino Ave. Suite 100

Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Phone (909) 348-5920

August 17, 2011

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

Mr. Adolph Gonzales	Southern California Edison
Ms. Jessica Pearson	Southern California Edison
Mr. Tracey Provence	Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California
Ms. Janet Chirrick	AT&T California
Mr. Scott Hunter	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Varghese George	City of Glendale
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc
Mr. Chuck Thurman	City of Banning (teleconference)
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc (teleconference)
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Mr. Mayo Jenkins	Golden State Water (teleconference)
Mr. Doug Schmaderer	City of Pasadena (teleconference)
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Comm./Local Serv.
Mr. Lawrence Yao	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Mr. Mark Denning	M-Power/TelePacific (teleconference)
Ms. Debbie Wooten	NextG Networks
Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Ms. Tracey Provence	MCI Comm/MCI Metro (teleconference)
Ms. Shawn Henderson	AT&T Mobility (teleconference)
Ms. Alicia Smith	Spr-Nextel/Spr. Comm.(teleconference)
Mr. Larry Thorne	CA CLEC/NewPath (teleconference)
Ms. Annetta Baker	City of Colton (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Ennis	T-Mobile USA
Mr. David Callender	ATC Outdoor DAS (teleconference)
Mr. Steve Garcia	ExTeNet Systems (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. Wolfe called the meeting to order at 9:05 and proceeded to take roll call. When roll call was complete, those not in attendances were the City of Burbank, the City of Azuza, the City of Anaheim, the City of Burbank, and Time Warner Cable.

HOUSEKEEPING:

Mr. Wolfe requested that member's who are teleconferencing mute their phones so that no interference is picked up. He added that if the teleconferencing members must step away from the meeting to please inform the chair when they leave and return to the meeting, in the event that a vote call transpired in their absence.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Wolfe inquired if the members had the opportunity to review the *July 20, 2011* Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. Ms. Corella stated that she was unable to complete the transcription of the above mentioned minutes at this time. Ms. Hernandez and the members welcomed Ms. Corella back from convalescence. Mr. Wolfe introduced Ms. Janet Chirrick of AT&T California who will be his replacement upon his retirement at year's end. He then allowed for introductions amongst the members.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Ms. Corella reported that the July 2011 operating expenses are \$63,306.66. This is an above average expensed month due to July being a three-payroll period month. The members were assessed this amount.

COMMUNICATIONS:

City of Ontario – interest in Committee membership.

Ms. Corella reported that she received a communication letter from the City of Ontario expressing their interest in committee membership. She read the correspondence verbatim to the members and stated that if members would like a copy of the correspondence it is available on the web in the packet for today's meeting. Ms. Corella concluded by stating that she would be responding to the City of Ontario with the necessary documents and to request the \$725.00 application fee. When the fee and required documents are received, then the application process would begin.

Mr. Gonzales stated a concern of SCE in that Ontario is not acting as a municipal electric entity, but as an internal communication entity. He inquired if this is an issue that the committee should review and discuss prior to accepting their application. He stated that it would be internal communication amongst the city and not providing external service.

Mr. Wolfe stated that this appears similar to what the City of Santa Monica intends on doing, that is internal service.

Ms. Hernandez stated that she reviewed the minutes of the City of Santa Monica interview, and she inquired if a CPCN was provided by the City of Santa Monica.

It was agreed to request the documents from the applicant, one document being the CPCN.

There were no further questions or concerns.

Ernst & Young on behalf of Sempra

Ms. Corella reported that she received correspondence from Mr. Prashanth Menon of Ernst & Young who is working with Sempra to develop a strategy to aid in the installation of their Data Collector Units (DCU). She added that he has sent her a questionnaire to which she responded to the best of her ability and knowledge. She further added that in today's meeting packet the questionnaire and responses are included if anyone chooses to review the documents. She concluded that Mr. Menon responded by thanking her for answering his questions.

SPECIAL REPORTS

There were no special reports

SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:

ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements

Mr. Hunter reported that the ad hoc met on August 9, 2011. The discussion was on the 2012 pole prices. The members should be receiving the pole price matrix to complete and submit no later than September 30, 2011. He suggested review of the minutes when they become available on the web.

Operating Committee

Mr. Hunter reported that the Operating committee met in July, and directed the members to review the minutes of this meeting which will be available on the web shortly.

Routine Revision Committee

Ms. Hernandez reported that the ad hoc committee met on Tuesday, August 9, 2011. She stated that there are several items on the discussion calendar of today's meeting. She added that the minutes are not available on the website at this time. When they become available, she suggested members review the minutes for the details.

Computer Communications ad hoc Committee

Ms. Pearson reported that this ad hoc committee met on August 9, 2011. The ad hoc committee is refining a survey to be sent to members in regards to the iPAM application. It is in draft form, but when complete it will be sent to the board members for completion.

Ms. Hernandez stated that there is urgency in deciding on iPAM in that Hyperlink has extended allowing the iPAM application to continue hosting on his server allowing the members additional time to test. She added that she is not certain how much longer Hyperlink will continue to host the application on his server with no compensation.

It was agreed to review and revise the iPAM survey at this time in order to expedite the decision on the software. Ms. Prescott presented the two options in acquiring access to utilize the iPAM application and the costs of hosting and maintenance. She stated that the choices are purchasing, licensing, or abandoning the project entirely. The survey would be sent to all board members, and the responses should aid the Computer Communications ad hoc committee in determining a direction. She added that if the majority choice is to lease or purchase iPAM all members will be assessed equally whether they choose to utilize it or not. It was noted that those members who chose not to process their work via iPAM and continue the old method, there will be cost to have the JPC office process their work in order to get it into the iPAM application. Ms. Prescott further added that she is aware that most members have their respective internal processes; therefore perhaps a program could be developed to data dump from iPAM to other applications.

There will be cost savings in resources expensed and time saved, since the application will expedite the JPA process. However, the savings may not be reflected initially, but will in time.

The draft survey was revised and when approved by the members, it was agreed to send the survey out immediately the Quick Users Guide attached. The response date would be no later than September 1, 2011.

Pole Loading ad hoc Committee

Ms. Haney reported that the ad hoc did not meet this month, but would meet when deemed necessary.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

There are no items for consent.

DISCUSSION CALENDAR:

Ms. Hernandez stated that originally revisions to sections 13.1, 13.2 and 5.2 were slated for discussion, but in that they were omitted from the agenda it could hold until the next meeting.

OTHER ITEMS: Unfinished Business

- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS (03/14/07)
- Item 1495: Pole Inspections - POLE LOADING/INSPECTIONS (10/13/09)
- Item 1503: Create FTP for Pole Loading - COMPUTER COMM (04/13/10)
- Item 1516: Form 48 Simplification - ROUTINE REVISION (11/09/10)
- Item 1520: Operating Expenses, Proport vs Equal - OPERATING CTTE (01/19/11)
- Item 1525: Solely Owned Poles Database - COMPUTER COMM. (04/20/2011)
- Item 1526: Review of Section 13.2 - ROUTINE REVISION (05/18/11)
- Item 1528: Tenant List GO 95 Notification - OPERATING CTTE (06/14/11)
- Item 1529 3rd Party Rate for Docs & Pole Records - ROUTINE REVISION (06/14/11)
- Item 1530: Section number for Topping Poles - ROUTINE REVISION (07/12/11)
- Item 1531: 2012 Pole Prices – AUTHORIZED COSTS (08/09/11)

Ms. Hernandez stated that **Item 1516: Form 48 Simplification** has been Board approved. It is on the agenda because the form was revised one last time by adding the legend. She added the revised Form 48 could now be utilized and both forms; the older version and the latest version are both acceptable. The older form requires pole numbers or a copy of the JPA. The newer version is available on the SCJPC.net in landscape and portrait.

Ms. Hernandez stated that **Item 1528: Tenant List GO 95 Notification** is to create a list of common tenants and make it available to all members via the SCJPC.net website. Mr. Gonzales stated that this issue was brought to the table by SCE. In many instances, it is difficult to obtain, identify and contact the correct party for GO infractions or other type communication.

Item 1519: *Environmental Issues*

This is a standing item.

New Business

Known Items:

WEI Conference

In that the WEI conference is being held from September 10th through the 21st, it was agreed that the Board would meet on the third Thursday of the month September 22 rather than the third Wednesday of the month.

Unknown Items:

Frontier Communications

Mr. Gonzales stated that Frontier Communications has acquired some VZ facilities, and are requesting an audience with the SCJPC members at their next Board meeting prior to submitting an application for membership. Their objective is to gain a better understanding of joint pole ownership.

Ms. Hernandez stated that this entity has inquired via written communication into membership. Ms. Corella added that she has responded and sent Frontier a return communication which includes a copy of the Agreement and a brief description to purchasing space on a pole.

Mr. Gonzales inquired if the committee members would approve an audience with Frontier Communications at the September 22, 2011 meeting.

There were no issues from the attending members; therefore Frontier Communications would be a guest at the next meeting.

Ms. Provence stated that she is curious why Frontier Communications has not changed records from VZ to Frontier. She is questioning their delay. Currently, VZ continues to reflect ownership on these poles where there is no interest of ownership on their part.

Mr. Gonzales responded that Frontier would need to answer this question.

Mr. Wolfe stated that they are considering the benefits of ownership versus lease agreements. The initial cost of membership is steep to some newer entities.

Ms. Provence stated in that she is new to this process, she would need assistance in how to handle this transfer if Frontier chooses not to become a member of the SCJPC.

The members responded that they would aid her when the time becomes necessary.

Engineered Steel vs. Lightweight Steel

Ms. Hernandez posed a question in regards to engineered steel poles and light weight steel poles. Her understanding is the engineered steel poles have a platform. She added that now her understanding is they can be underground. How does she deterentiate between the two.

Mr. Gonzales responded that per the ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) the platform limits room therefore, the platform is buried underground. To differentiate he added, there is a vent type protruding on the engineered steel pole allowing condensation, which is not on lightweight steel poles.

Ms. Hernandez questioned replacing wood with steel when there is no benefit for her. Mr. Hunter responded that wood would be replaced with steel for wind loading and deterioration purposes and these poles are the best choice for replacement in these and other instances. Wood is preferred, but would not suffice in many instances.

Contact Info for AT&T California and Verizon California

Ms. Walls inquired of AT&T California and Verizon California if they had shade files with contact information of specific areas. He added that his organization is attempting to create an overlay for contact information where a pole number is entered and all contact info can be viewed. Mr. Wolfe and Ms. Provence responded that they would work on arriving with a file to aid the City of Los Angeles with attaining the correct contact information.

SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Routine Revision	09/13/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Authorized Costs	09/13/11	Following	Routine Revision
Computer Comm	09/13/11	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	09/22/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	09/22/11	Following	Administrative Board

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Chow adjourned the meeting at 11:55 a.m., until September 22, 2011.

Mr. Robert Wolfe, Chair

Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operations

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

1400 Montefino Ave. Suite 100

Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Phone (909) 348-5920

September 22, 2011

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

Mr. Adolph Gonzales	Southern California Edison
Ms. Jessica Pearson	Southern California Edison
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Mr. Tracey Provence	Verizon California
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California
Ms. Janet Chirrick	AT&T California
Mr. Michael Wolf	AT&T California
Mr. Jeff Wolf	AT&T California
Mr. Scott Hunter	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Lawrence Yao	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Mr. Alvin Aska	City of Anaheim
Mr. Varghese George	City of Glendale
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Comm./Local Serv.
Ms. Tracey Provence	MCI Comm/MCI Metro
Mr. Daniel Lippert	City of Burbank
Mr. Doug Schmaderer	City of Pasadena (teleconference)
Mr. Mayo Jenkins	Golden State Water (teleconference)
Mr. Randall Starkey	Time Warner Cable (teleconference)
Ms. Shawn Henderson	AT&T Mobility (teleconference)
Ms. Alicia Smith	Spr-Nextel/Spr. Comm.(teleconference)
Ms. Annetta Baker	City of Colton (teleconference)
Mr. David Patterson	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Gary Clark	City of Banning
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc (teleconference)
Ms. Maryan Farajzadeh	City of Vernon (teleconference)
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Mr. Larry Thorne	CA CLEC/NewPath (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Ennis	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Darryl Webster	ExTeNet Systems (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff

Guests:

Mr. Stephen Pebley	Frontier Communications
Mr. Dave Chaney	NJUNS
Mr. Roy Beavers	NJUNS

CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. Wolfe called the meeting to order at 9:00 and proceeded to take roll call. When roll call was complete, those not in attendances were M-Power/TelePacific, and ATC Outdoor DAS.

HOUSEKEEPING:

Mr. Wolfe requested that member's who are teleconferencing mute their phones so that no interference is picked up. He added that if the teleconferencing members must step away from the meeting to please inform the chair when they leave and return to the meeting, in the event that a vote call transpired in their absence. The lunch order menu was distributed to the attendees.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Wolfe inquired if the members had the opportunity to review the *July 20, 2011* and the *August 17, 2011* Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. Mr. Wolfe then inquired if any members had revisions, additions or deletions to the July and August Board minutes. It that there were no revisions stated, Mr. Wolfe solicited a motion to accept the July and August Board minutes. Mr. Chow motioned to accept the July and August minutes as written. Mr. Hunter seconded the motion. After roll was taken, the minutes passed unanimously.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Ms. Pranata reported that the August 2011 operating expenses are \$48,938.38. This is an average expensed month. The members were assessed this amount.

COMMUNICATIONS:

Metro PCS – Letter of Membership Interest.

Ms. Pranata reported that she received a communication letter from Metro PCS expressing their interest in committee membership. She announced that the letter is included in the packet of today's meeting.

SPECIAL REPORTS

Frontier Communications – Mr. Stephan Pebley

Mr. Pebley, who is a director of engineering for Frontier Communications, introduced himself to the members and stated that he is responsible for the Blythe and Mojave County, Arizona areas. He added that in July Frontier purchased 4 million access lines from Verizon California in approximately 22 states. In the process they are discovering the conditions necessary for joint pole transactions, primarily joining the SCJPC. He further added that there are about 4,400 poles in the Blythe area. He inquired if there is the possibility of adjusting the 75K initial membership fee in that his organization did not budget the monies for this fee. Ms. Hernandez inquired as to the extent of adjustment Frontier would consider. Ms. Prescott inquired if the transactions would primarily involve SCE; perhaps a third party agreement would be cost effective.

Ms. Provence stated that her concern is that these poles transfer on record to Frontier either by ownership or lease agreement for resolution.

Mr. Chow commented if the initial membership cost includes daily transactions, in his opinion Verizon California has contributed their fair share on behalf of the poles in question.

After some discussion it was agreed to review the variables included in the initial membership fee and review the Agreement for allowances and/or adjustments for the initial membership fee. The consensus is to assign this issue to the Operating Committee to be further discussed at that level.

NJUNS Presentation – Mr. Roy Beavers – Mr. Dave Chaney (Accent)

Mr. Beavers opened by giving a brief history of his experience in the joint pole ownership arena and NJUNS. He stated that he spent 25 years in outside plant for Bell South. He added that NJUNS has been in existence since 1990. It was prompted by a pole fatality in that records of pole transfers were not available. Members to NJUNS contribute to any enhancements to the program. NJUNS is a tracking and communication system between member utilities, and it is country wide.

Mr. Chaney than proceeded to state that his organization provides the IT software and support to NJUNS, a not for profit organization. NJUNS is communication software, and does not include asset management. He added that his organization has a system that is an asset management tool.

Mr. Beavers stated that his organization offers WebEx training sessions on the application. There is a flat fee to become part of the NJUNS system, and a fixed annual fee once you are a member. He then proceeded with his presentation of NJUNS. Members are identified by their respective member code, and email address. All member information and contacts are easily available.

Mr. Beavers demonstrated how a ticket (document to start the process) is processed and recorded. He presented the entire process from start to completion commenting along the process and answering any questions.

Mr. Mike Wolf commented he is new to the representation arena and is aware of the time and money spent on developing iPAM however, he believes that it would be advantageous to have another developer demonstrate their product and as a committee have other options.

In conclusion, Mr. Chaney stated that issues for consideration when deciding on a software application and the software company are functionality of the system and what you want it to do, cost for now and the future. The software vendor, as well, should be given great consideration. Even if the product is terrific is the vendor solvent in the event that sometime in the future this vendor is no longer in business, and unable for provide support. The vendor should be up on the latest technology available for your system. He added that NJUNS today meets this criterion. He added that his Veraset application is an asset management tool for underground and pole facilities. It performs outbound and inbound billing and reconciliation of records and the database, and there is a mobile component linked to this process. He then demonstrated the application screens and inquired if the members had any questions or concerns.

Ms. Hernandez stated that she could not comprehend how this application would process a JPA and she is having difficulty correlating and comparing it to iPAM. She also inquired into an approximate cost for the application.

Mr. Beavers responded that the initial membership fee to join NJUNS for the state of California is \$12,000.00 and an annual fee of \$18,000.00.

Mr. Wolfe thanked Mr. Beavers and Mr. Chaney for demonstrating their software to the committee members, and added that it was helpful information.

SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:

ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements

Mr. Hunter reported that the ad hoc met on September 13, 2011. The discussion was on pole prices and reminded the members that pole prices are due by September 30, 2011. The committee discussed cost causer for pole owners who are no longer a committee member. He concluded by referring the members to review the minutes of the meeting.

Operating Committee

Mr. Hunter reported that the Operating committee met in August 17, 2011. He reported that the members reviewed the standard agenda items, and created a third party cost when requesting pole records or any other SCJPC documents. The cost will be \$60.00. He concluded by directing the members to review the minutes of the meeting for further details.

Routine Revision Committee

Ms. Hernandez reported that the ad hoc committee met on Tuesday, September 13, 2011. She stated that it was agreed to review and discuss section 7.13 as to the true intent and interpretation of this section. She encouraged the members to attend the next Routine Revision meeting in that the ad hoc committee would like to hear how other members interpret this section. The committee also discussed section 7.4 and is of the opinion that a supplement section is needed describing as to why the pole is being set in the same hole in that this method is a greater cost. She added that in regards to section 7.3, additional comments should be noted on the JPA.

The Form 48 has been updated and is on discussion of this agenda.

She further added that a plant damage situation was discussed where a wireless site went down, and when replacing the pole power is prohibited to place meter on poles due to their meter department. This situation places wireless in jeopardy in that they must go through the permitting process again with a different design to get their meter up again. Mr. Chow responded that power does not have to allow meters on poles. The members briefly discussed this issue.

Lastly, Ms. Hernandez requested members to remind their JPA associates that when a signed copy is received, that they ensure a signed copy is sent to all members' party to the JPA in that the prelim will match the final copy of the JPA. The members discussed the problems caused by these changes when signed copies are not sent to all members and the prelim does not match the final. It was agreed to discuss this further at the next Routine Revision ad hoc committee meeting.

In closing, Ms. Hernandez recommended that members read the minutes of the meeting when they become available for further details.

Computer Communications ad hoc Committee

Mr. Chow reported that this ad hoc committee met on September 13, 2011. He stated that the ad hoc committee reviewed the responses from the iPAM survey. An email message has been sent to those members who have not responded informing them that the cut-off date has been extended to September 22, 2011.

Pole Loading ad hoc Committee

Ms. Haney reported that the ad hoc did not meet this month, but would meet when deemed necessary.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

There are no items for consent.

DISCUSSION CALENDAR:

Item 1516: Form 48 – revised with a deletion (portrait/Landscape)

Ms. Hernandez stated that it was agreed by the Routine Revision ad hoc committee to delete the line reading, “This confirms – field-telephone/email notification to _____ Date _____”. Ms. Hernandez motioned to accept the final revision of the Form 48. Mr. Ennis seconded the motion which upon voting passed unanimously. It was noted that the old Form 48 would continue to be accepted, but the JPA or list of poles must be attached. The objective is to eliminate the old form through attrition. This item is now closed.

Item 1526: Review of Section 13 (revised)

Ms. Hernandez stated that the revision to Section 13.1 was the title to read, “Correction or Record/Cost Recovery”, and the section title to read, “Correction of Record/Cancellation”. She added that this section referred only to refunds and not additional costs due. She further added that originally this section alluded to refunds only, and there are instances when additional monies are due a member.

Mr. Gonzales stated that perhaps the revision to address additional funds due should be in section 13. 2 as refund or cost recovery as opposed to 13.1 which addresses correction of record.

After brief discussion, it was agreed to return this issue to the ad hoc committee for further work. The item will remain open.

Item 1530: New section for topping poles (Section 5.2)

Ms. Hernandez stated that there are possibly topped poles being left in the field. This section would address topping 60’ poles or greater and if it remains joint, this section would make the necessary record corrections. Mr. Chow motioned to accept section 5.2 as written. Ms. Hernandez seconded the motion which upon voting passed unanimously. This item is now closed.

OTHER ITEMS: Unfinished Business

Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS (03/14/07)
Item 1495: Pole Inspections - POLE LOADING/INSPECTIONS (10/13/09)
Item 1503: Create FTP for Pole Loading - COMPUTER COMM (04/13/10)
Item 1516: Form 48 Simplification - ROUTINE REVISION (11/09/10)
Item 1525: Solely Owned Poles Database - COMPUTER COMM. (04/20/2011)
Item 1526: Review of Section 13.2 - ROUTINE REVISION (05/18/11)
Item 1530: Section number for Topping Poles - ROUTINE REVISION (07/12/11)
Item 1531: 2012 Pole Prices – AUTHORIZED COSTS (08/09/11)

There were no issues, concerns, or discussion on the approved item numbers.

Item 1519: *Environmental Issues*

This is a standing item.

New Business

Known Items:

There were no known items.

Unknown Items:

Transcribed Minutes

Ms. Hernandez reported that she was at a disposition and a lawyer requested that no minutes be erased. Mr. Chow responded that this lawyer does not represent the SCJPC and does not have authority for such a request. Ms. Pranata stated that all minutes are transferred and saved on an external drive.

JPA Questions/Pole inspections

Ms. Provence questioned where she could direct questions in regards to the joint process. She added that she is new to this arena and is not the person to provide the correct answers for those handling Verizon California joint pole transactions. Mr. Wolfe responded that all representatives would be willing to aid those attempting the JPA process.

Next, Ms. Provence questioned the CPUC ruling on pole inspections, and if these inspections costs could be shared. Mr. Michael Wolf stated that his organization is thinking along the same lines as Verizon California. He added

talking about proposing a capable and approved third party to inspect the poles and share the one cost.

Mr. Chow stated that he would have to speak with his regulatory personnel since SCE has been under these inspection requirements for many years and currently do these inspections. He added that this idea would require acceptance by the commission. The members discussed this idea briefly.

Form 48

Mr. Chow requested adding an item number to the Routine Revision ad hoc committee addressing the Form 48 issuance prior to one member finalizing another members JPA specific to 4.0. After brief discussion, **Item 1532: 18.1-F Form 48** has been assigned to the Routine Revision ad hoc committee.

SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Routine Revision	10/11/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Authorized Costs	10/11/11	Following	Routine Revision
Computer Comm	10/11/11	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	10/19/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	10/19/11	Following	Administrative Board

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Wolfe adjourned the meeting at 12:33 p.m., until October 19, 2011.

Mr. Robert Wolfe, Chair

Ms. Angela Pranata, Asst Mgr. of Operations

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

1400 Montefino Ave. Suite 100

Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Phone (909) 348-5920

October 19, 2011

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. Jessica Pearson	Southern California Edison
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Mr. Tracey Provence	Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Janet Chirrick	AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Michael Wolf	AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Scott Hunter	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Lawrence Yao	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Mr. Alvin Aska	City of Anaheim (teleconference)
Mr. Varghese George	City of Glendale
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Comm./Local Serv.
Ms. Tracey Provence	MCI Comm./MCI Metro (teleconference)
Mr. Daniel Lippert	City of Burbank
Mr. Doug Schmaderer	City of Pasadena
Mr. Paul Fuller	Golden State Water (teleconference)
Mr. Dave Patterson	Time Warner Cable (teleconference)
Ms. Shawn Henderson	AT&T Mobility (teleconference)
Ms. Alicia Smith	Spr-Nextel/Spr. Comm.(teleconference)
Ms. Phillip Hinojosa	City of Colton (teleconference)
Mr. David Patterson	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Gary Clark	City of Banning
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc (teleconference)
Ms. Ali Nour	City of Vernon (teleconference)
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Mr. Mark Denning	M-Power/TelePacific (teleconference)
Mr. Larry Thorne	CA CLEC/NewPath (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Ennis	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Steve Garcia	ExTeNet Systems (teleconference)
Mr. David Callender	ATC Outdoor DAS (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

CALL TO ORDER:

In that committee president Mr. Wolfe was unable to sit at the table, committee vice-presidents Mr. Walls and Mr. Hunter chaired the meeting. Mr. Wolfe was in attendance via teleconference. Mr. Hunter opened the meeting at 9:10 am. Mr. Walls then proceeded with the roll call.

HOUSEKEEPING:

Mr. Hunter requested that member's who are teleconferencing mute their phones so that no interference is picked up. He added that if the teleconferencing members must step away from the meeting to please inform the chair when they leave and return to the meeting, in the event that a vote call transpired in their absence. He added that following this meeting, the operating committee members have an appointment to view possible properties for JPC office relocation; therefore, the meeting must not lag in time. The lunch would be ordered and delivered prior to members returning to the office upon completion of the property viewing.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Hunter inquired if the members had the opportunity to review the *September 22, 2011* Board minutes for any revisions, additions or deletions. Mr. Hunter then inquired if any members had revisions, additions or deletions to the September Board minutes. It that there were no revisions stated, Mr. Hunter solicited a motion to accept the minutes as written. Ms. Hernandez motioned to accept the minutes as written, Ms. Haney seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Ms. Corella reported that the September 2011 operating expenses are \$49,916.09. This is an average expensed month. The members were assessed this amount.

COMMUNICATIONS:

LifeRay Properties

Ms. Corella reported that office building housing the JPC office has been purchased by an owner occupied company, and the committee staff must relocate. Per the lease the new owners must provide the committee with comparable office space. They have offered another suite in the building that is relatively comparable, but the office would require location when the lease is up at the end of five years. Therefore, the Operating committee is of the opinion that finding another property

would be in the best interest of the committee. The operating committee members will be viewing property considerations directly after the meeting.

Frontier Communications

Ms. Corella reported that she received documents in support of Frontier Communications application for membership. She added that Frontier requested an invoice for the amount of the application in that their accounts payable could process the check. She further added that she sent a communication to Mr. Pebley of Frontier that his request for the waiving of the initial membership fee cannot be granted. She concluded upon receipt of the application fee she will assign an item number to the Operating committee and the application process shall begin.

Metro PCS

Ms. Corella reported that Metro PCS has requested a copy of the Form W-9 to process their application fee check. Ms. Corella added that she had to sign a company code of ethics form for Metro PCS, as all vendors must complete this form prior to processing any payments. She concluded by stating that when their application check is received an item number would be assigned to the Operating committee and the application process shall commence.

Mr. Robert Wolfe Retirement Luncheon Invitation

Ms. Corella stated that the invitations for Mr. Wolfe's retirement luncheon have been sent out to the membership. The venue is the Diamond Bar Golf Course banquet room and those members who wish to, may join Mr. Wolfe in a round of golf following the luncheon.

SPECIAL REPORTS

There were no special reports.

SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:

ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements

Mr. Hunter reported that the Authorized Costs Elements ad hoc committee did not meet in October.

Operating Committee

Mr. Hunter reported that the Operating committee met on September 22, 2011. He reported that the primary topic of discussion was the relocation of the JPC office. The ad hoc committee discussed the request of a waiver of the initial

membership fee for Frontier Communications. It was agreed that this request could not be granted per the Agreement and the By-Laws. He directed members to refer to the minutes of that meeting for further details.

Routine Revision Committee

Ms. Hernandez reported that the ad hoc committee met on Tuesday, October 11, 2011. She stated that the members discussed pole butt removals in those special circumstances when the butt is obstructed by a private parties block wall or other structure. It was agreed that his cost would be handled on a case by case basis via 1.2. The members discussed revising Section 7.13. She concluded by directing members to the minutes when they become available on the web.

Computer Communications ad hoc Committee

Mr. Chow reported that this ad hoc committee met on October 11, 2011. He reported that the members discussed the path forward for iPAM. The members are concerned if it is possible to have an application that would interface with the members respective applications, resulting in greater time efficiency. He added that a meeting with Hyperlink would be scheduled to discuss this matter. He encouraged all members to refer to the minutes for greater details.

Pole Loading ad hoc Committee

Ms. Haney reported that the ad hoc met on October 11, 2011 and primarily discussed the ability to identify power facilities. She added that DWP is compiling a process to aid communication fielders the ability to better identify power facilities. She directed members to review the minutes of the meeting for further details.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

There are no items for consent.

DISCUSSION CALENDAR:

Item 1526: Review of Section 13.2

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion by stating that originally 13.2 was to be revised, but after review and discussion of the section the consensus is to add verbiage to section 13.1 (see attached). The objective is to relay to users that this section is for refunds, but also for additional costs. Therefore, the title of this section now includes "Cost Recovery". She added that this section is applicable up to five years as stated in section 13.2.

Mr. Chow stated that a process should be understood in those instances where the recovery is beyond five years and must be initiated via s 1.2. Mr. Wolfe stated in these instances he contacts the member directly to work on 1.2. Mr. Chow stated that in many instances the pulling routine needs correction in JPAs greater than five years.

Ms. Hernandez stated that the five year limit applies to monetary transactions, but a pole record may be corrected at anytime.

After discussion Ms. Hernandez motioned to accept the revision to section 13.2, Mr. Chow seconded the motion which after tallying the votes the motion passed unanimously.

Item 1532: Section 18.1-F Form 48 Example

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion by stating that this example is not up for approval but merely discussion. She stated that originally the members agreed that a JPA could be attached in lieu of listing the poles on the form. However, after review it was noted that the operation number associated with the pole must be listed on the form. Therefore, it was agreed that the pole number and the operation number must be listed on the Form 48, and not allowing the attaching of the JPA as notification of the pole numbers. The ad hoc committee would like reaction from the members on not allowing the JPA attachment in lieu of listing poles. There were concerns with the verbiage in operation lines 10, 11, and 12. The consensus is not to allow the attached JPA in lieu of listing poles on the form. This issue will be discussed further at the next Routine Revision meeting.

Item 1535: Clarification of Section 7:13

Ms. Hernandez opened by stating that there is grey area in the verbiage of this section. It states that a JPA notice of intent must be issued, however, it does not specify at what point in the process the JPA must be issued. If a pole has been replaced and the JPA notice of intent is issued after the action, there is a good argument that the JPA was in fact issued and the initiator did not fail to issue a JPA, thus following the Routine as stated. Ms. Hernandez stated that the ad hoc committee would like to clarify that the JPA must be issued prior to the action leaving no room for ambiguity. The ad hoc committee is proposing revision to this section (see attached). The consensus is to return this item number to the Routine Revision ad hoc committee for further discussion

OTHER ITEMS: Unfinished Business

Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS (03/14/07)

Item 1495: Pole Inspections - POLE LOADING/INSPECTIONS (10/13/09)

Item 1503: Create FTP for Pole Loading - COMPUTER COMM (04/13/10)

Item 1526: Review of Section 13.2 - ROUTINE REVISION (05/18/11)

Item 1531: 2012 Pole Prices – AUTHORIZED COSTS (08/09/11)
Item 1532: 18.1-F Form 48 Example- ROUTINE REVISION (09/22/11)
Item 1533: Office Relocation – OPERATING COMMITTEE (09/22/11)
Item 1534: DWP Proc to Share Pole Loading Data - POLE LOADING (10/11/11)
Item 1535: Clarification of Section 7.13 - ROUTINE REVISION (10/11/11)
Item 1536: Form 7 to JPC Guidelines - ROUTINE REVISION (10/11/11)
Item 1537: Example 8 Revision - ROUTINE REVISION (10/11/11)

It was noted that **2012 pole prices** are due for preparation for the next Authorized Costs Elements meeting.

Item 1519: *Environmental Issues*

This is a standing item.

New Business

Known Items:

Nominating Committee for 2012 SCJPC Officers

Mr. Hunter opened by stating that those in attendance would consist of the nominating committee and would proceed to nominate the incoming year's SCJPC president and vice president. After discussion the City of Los Angeles was nominated for SCJPC president, and Verizon Wireless was nominated for 2012 SCJPC vice president. After discussion it was agreed that the ad hoc committees would retain their current chairs. The officer nominees would be on the consent calendar of the next board meeting.

Unknown Items:

Mr. Chow stated that he would like an item number assigned to the Review of Section 4.0. **Item 1539: Review of Section 4.0** has been assigned to the Routine Revision ad hoc committee.

SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Routine Revision	11/08/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Authorized Costs	11/08/11	Following	Routine Revision
Computer Comm	11/08/11	Following	Authorized Costs
Pole Loading Comm	11/08/11	Following	Computer Comm
Administrative Board	10/19/11	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	10/19/11	Following	Administrative Board

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Hunter adjourned the meeting at 10:25 a.m., until November 16, 2011.

Mr. Scott Hunter, Chair

Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operations

13.1 Correction of Record/Cost Recovery

Correction of error in recorded data or any other detail shall be made on Joint Pole Authorization and, where necessary, adjustment for price shall be made in accordance with date of Joint Pole Authorization that has been found to be in error. (See Example 8, Page 18-13) Recorded interests in conflict with the Routine shall not be corrected, except with the consent of all Members concerned, until pole is replaced, or an incoming Member desires to purchase interest, or one joint owner wishes to relinquish interest.

The Committee shall issue a new record for all corrections except those relating to pole locations. Member noting error in location of pole shall correct its record and advise other joint owners and the Committee by Form 7 J/P Memorandum of necessary correction.

Cost allocation shall also be authorized, where required, for reinstatement of record or any other detail in which a completed transaction is in error for five (5) years from the bill of sale date unless otherwise negotiated by special agreement. (See Section 1.2) (Revised October 2011).Effective January 2012.

Attachment II

7.13 Failure to Issue Notice of Intention [Prior to Replacement](#).

If any member replaces pole(s) or anchors (s) [prior to](#) issuing a Notice of Intention to the joint owners on record, that member:

- Will pay all PTD charges
- Will pay all transfer charges of the joint owner(s)
- Will pay for any additional authorized costs incurred due to the pole replacement

This section will not apply to pole replacements agreed to for emergencies, priority poles or storm conditions. For these replacements, use section 7.11. For plant damage replacements refer to section 7.6. ([Revised October 2011](#))

Effective January 2012.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

1400 Montefino Ave. Suite 100
Diamond Bar, CA 91765
Phone (909) 348-5920

November 16, 2011

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

Mr. Jim Eastwood	Southern California Edison
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Mr. Tracey Provence	Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe	AT&T California
Mr. Michael Wolf	AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Scott Hunter	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dennis Walls	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Lawrence Yao	City of Riverside (teleconference)
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Comm./Local Serv.
Ms. Tracey Provence	MCI Comm./MCI Metro (teleconference)
Mr. Paul Fuller	Golden State Water (teleconference)
Mr. Randall Starkey	Time Warner Cable (teleconference)
Ms. Shawn Henderson	AT&T Mobility (teleconference)
Ms. Alicia Smith	Spr-Nextel/Spr. Comm.(teleconference)
Ms. Annetta Baker	City of Colton (teleconference)
Mr. David Patterson	City of Azusa (teleconference)
Mr. Dana Fabing	City of Lompoc
Ms. Maryan Farajzadeh	City of Vernon (teleconference)
Mr. Jim Brown	XO Communications (teleconference)
Mr. Mark Denning	M-Power/TelePacific (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Ennis	T-Mobile USA
Mr. David Callender	ATC Outdoor DAS (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. Wolfe opened the meeting at 9:10 am. He then proceeded with roll call. When roll call was complete, those members not in attendance are City of Pasadena, City of Anaheim, City of Banning, CA, CLEC, City of Glendale, City of Burbank, and ExTeNet Systems.

HOUSEKEEPING:

Mr. Wolfe requested that member's who are teleconferencing mute their phones so that no interference is picked up. He added that if the teleconferencing members must step away from the meeting to please inform the chair when they leave and return to the meeting, in the event that a vote call transpired in their absence. He added there is no lunch orders today in that there is a special luncheon following the meetings today.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Wolfe than inquired if the members had reviewed the minutes of the *October 19 2011* Board meeting, and if there were any comments, additions, deletions, or revisions. There were no changes to the minutes; therefore, Mr. Wolfe solicited a motion to accept the minutes as written. Ms. Haney motioned to accept the October 19, 2011 minutes as written. Ms. Hernandez seconded the motion, which after the vote tally was completed, the motion carried.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Ms. Corella reported that the October 2011 operating expenses are \$44,601.97. This is slightly a below average expensed month in that October was a free rent month per the office lease agreement. The members were assessed this amount.

COMMUNICATIONS:

Frontier Communications

Ms. Corella reported that Frontier Communications continues to show interest in membership. She added that she has sent a copy of the SCJPC Form W-9 to their accounting department so that the application fee check might be processed. She concluded upon receipt of the application fee she will assign an item number to the Operating committee and the application process shall begin.

Metro PCS

Ms. Corella reported that she has received the membership application fee of \$725.00 from Metro PCS. She added that the financial documents that Metro PCS has provided are in hard copy, but further added that she would communicate with the Metro PCS contract and request a soft copy to allow the copy to be sent via email to all members for their review. She added that she would assign an item number to the Operating committee for the Metro PCS application.

Office Relocation

Ms. Corella reported that the Operating committee has submitted offers for relocation on two properties. She added that she has received a counter offer from one of the properties and is awaiting the counter from the second property. She stated that when the second counter offer is received, she will schedule a WebEx meeting for the Operating committee members to review and discuss the offers.

SPECIAL REPORTS

There were no special reports.

SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:

ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements

Mr. Hunter reported that the Authorized Costs Elements ad hoc committee met November 8, 2011 the primary topic of discussion was the proposed 2012 pole prices. He added that the first pole price draft is on the discussion calendar of this meeting. He directed the members to review the minutes of the meeting for further details.

Operating Committee

Mr. Hunter reported that the Operating committee met on October 19, 2011. The meeting primarily consisted of discussion on office relocation. As stated earlier two offers have been submitted, and one counter offer has been received and the committee is awaiting the second offer. He directed the members to review the minutes of further details.

Routine Revision Committee

Ms. Hernandez reported that the ad hoc committee met on Tuesday, November 8, 2011. She added that it was a lengthy meeting. She stated that several items discussed within the ad hoc committee are on today's discussion section of the agenda. She suggested members review the minutes of the meeting for details.

Computer Communications ad hoc Committee

Mr. Chow reported that this ad hoc committee met on November 8, 2011. He stated that the primary topic for discussion was iPAM. He added that Mr. Atalla of Hyperlink was a guest at the meeting and answered questions from the members in regards to an application that would interface between iPAM and the members different system programs. With the current technology of today, it is quite possible to create an interface program for iPAM and other system applications. With this

the ad hoc committee is recommending moving forward with the lease option for iPAM and there is a line budget item on the proposed 2012 operating budget. He recommended to members to read the minutes of the meeting.

Pole Loading ad hoc Committee

Ms. Haney reported that this ad hoc committee is currently on hold.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

2012 SCJPC Officers

President - City of Los Angeles Vice President – Verizon Wireless

Mr. Wolfe announced that an election was held last month and he is entertaining a motion to approve the nominated officers for 2012. Ms. Haney motioned to accept the nominated officers for 2012. Mr. Hunter seconded the motion, which after the votes were tallied, the motion carried.

DISCUSSION CALENDAR:

Item 1531: 2012 Pole Prices

Brought to the attention of the authorized costs ad hoc committee is the relatively low pole prices submitted by Verizon California (VZ). Ms. Provence stated that her costs are lower than others, but she understands that VZ costs have always been lower in comparison to other member costs. Ms. Prescott questioned the number of labor hours reflecting on the VZ calculation matrix. She added that she wanted to ensure that the hours for the entire crew are included in the VZ costs, and not just that of one crew member since it appears a relatively short time for a pole to be set. Ms. Prescott reiterated that she wants to ensure that the total hours include the entire crew hours. Ms. Provence responded that she did not combine the hours of a four man crew which is the standard crew size for VZ. She requested additional time to recalculate her costs. The members agreed to table this item until the next meeting to allow VZ to recalculate and resubmit their costs. This item is tabled at this time.

Revisions to Sections 18.1-D and 19.5

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion by stating that it was noted that some JPAs are being received with charges for pole stubbing, and pole tagging and these items are not reflected in Section 19.5. For the sake of consistency and clarification the

verbiage: may include item 6, and 15. She reiterated that these items are included in inspection JPAs, but are not referenced in Section 19.5. The ad hoc committee has proposed addition of the items verbiage to the section.

Next, Ms. Hernandez opened discussion in regards to Section 18.1-D. She stated that the Form 48 is not required on pole inspections in that when the JPA is received the work has transpired. Therefore, the Routine Revision ad hoc committee is proposing the addition of a note to this section. The note reads: Form 48 not required on work performed in accordance to Section 19.5. After brief discussion on the verbiage revisions to the above referenced sections, Mr. Wolfe solicited a motion to accept the proposed revisions. Ms. Haney motioned to accept the proposed revisions, Ms. Prescott seconded the motion. When the vote tally was completed the motion passed unanimously.

Item 1538: 2012 Operating Budget

The members reviewed the budget draft. Mr. Wolfe inquired if there were any questions or comments for discussion. It was noted that the expense for the leasing of the iPAM software has increased. There were no further comments or questions. Mr. Wolfe then solicited motion to accept the proposed 2012 operating budget. Mr. Hunter motioned to approve the budget. Ms. Haney seconded the motion. When the votes were tallied the motion carried.

Form 48 Revised

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion on this issue. She stated that the verbiage, “*or attach JPA*” was been removed from the form, and the poles must be listed on the Form 48. Ms. Hernandez noted additional revisions to the form. Mr. Wolfe added that this form is available in portrait and landscape and both formats are acceptable. The old form will continue to be accepted, however, the objective is to discontinue use of the old form through attrition. After brief discussion, Mr. Wolfe solicited a motion to accept the final draft of the Form 48. Ms. Haney motioned to accept the revised form. Mr. Walls seconded the motion, which upon tallying of the votes the motion carried.

Item 1535: Clarification of Section 7:13

Ms. Hernandez opened by stating that the ad hoc Routine Revision committee added greater clarity to this section. She reported in the title the verbiage, “prior to” replaced, “of”. She added that “prior to” has been inserted throughout the section. The members briefly discussed the revisions. Ms. Haney motioned to accept revisions to the section as revised. Mr. Chow seconded the motion. Upon tallying of the vote, the motion passed.

OTHER ITEMS: Unfinished Business

- Item 1435: iPAM Cntrct Phse I Comp – COMPUTER COMMUNICATIONS (03/14/07)
- Item 1495: Pole Inspections - POLE LOADING/INSPECTIONS (10/13/09)
- Item 1503: Create FTP for Pole Loading - COMPUTER COMM (04/13/10)
- Item 1531: 2012 Pole Prices – AUTHORIZED COSTS (08/09/11)
- Item 1532: 18.1-F Form 48 Example- ROUTINE REVISION (09/22/11)
- Item 1533: Office Relocation – OPERATING COMMITTEE (09/22/11)
- Item 1534: DWP Proc to Share Pole Loading Data - POLE LOADING (10/11/11)
- Item 1535: Clarification of Section 7.13 - ROUTINE REVISION (10/11/11)
- Item 1537: Example 8 Revision - ROUTINE REVISION (10/11/11)
- Item 1538: 2012 Operating Budget - OPERATING COMMITTEE (10/19/11)
- Item 1539: Review of Section 4.0 - ROUTINE REVISION (10/19/11)
- Item 1540: Review of Pole Location Chang Process – ROUTINE REVISION(11/8/11)

There were no unfinished business issues discussed.

Item 1519: *Environmental Issues*

This is a standing item.

New Business

Known Items:

There were no known items

Unknown Items:

Sprint-Nextel as payee.

Mr. Wolfe stated that Sprint-Nextel is failing to clear checks issued to them by AT&T California. This is creating a problem for the AT&T California accounting department. He added that he would work with Ms. Alicia Smith, the Sprint-Nextel representative, to resolve this issue.

Form 2 Revision

Mr. Chow displayed a copy of the Form 2 with a proposed SCE revision. He is proposing to relocate the Bill No. line from the upper right hand corner to the upper left hand corner in that the form is in legal size and the right end is folded over making it cumbersome to read the bill number. Mr. Wolfe stated that this would require uniformity or the form would be both folded on the right and left end. After

discussion it was agreed to assign this issue to an ad hoc committee. **Item 1541: Revised Final Form 2** has been assigned to Operating for further discussion.

Section 7.11 and 7.3

Mr. Chow opened discussion on Section 7.11, where a power pole is replaced per a GO95 space infraction and rule 94, with a pole that is five feet greater than the old pole and the grandfather issue is addressed. SCE is finding members are changing 7.11 to 7.3. Mr. Eastwood stated that some poles are less than 25 years old but are deteriorated and must be replaced. Ms. Hernandez stated if the form 2 states deteriorated pole than it will not be changed, but if it does not and the pole is less than 25 years, one assumes it is an overbuild.

Mr. Chow stated when replacing a pole one must consider the possibility of a GO 95 infraction should a member desire to attach to the pole in the future. The members discussed this issue. It was agreed that SCE would notate deteriorated or other relevant information on the Form 2 in these instances.

Mr. Chow thanked Mr. Wolfe for his presidency in the last year, and all his contributions to the SCJPC and the NCJPA. The members joined in applauding and wishing Mr. Wolfe their very best.

SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:

Future meetings were scheduled as follows:

Routine Revision	01/10/12	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Authorized Costs	01/10/12	Following	Routine Revision
Computer Comm	01/10/12	Following	Authorized Costs
Administrative Board	01/18/12	9:00 a.m.	Committee Office
Operating Committee	01/18/12	Following	Administrative Board

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Wolfe adjourned the meeting at 10:45 a.m., until January 18, 2012.

Mr. Robert Wolfe, President

Ms. Jennie Corella, Mgr. of Operations