

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

March 13, 2012

A meeting of the **Compliance ad hoc Committee** took place on the above date, at 12:55 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Mr. Larry Chow	So. California Edison
Mr. Jim Eastwood	So. California Edison
Ms. Jessica Pearson	So. California Edison
Ms. Tracey Province	Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Scott Hunter	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Steve Brown	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Local Serv.
Ms. Shawn Henderson	AT&T Mobility
Ms. Dennis Ennis	T-Mobile USA
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint/Nextel (teleconference)
M.s Janet Chirrick	AT&T California
Mr. Dennis Ennis	T-Mobile USA
Ms. Maria Ortiz	CA-CLEC LLC/NewPath
Ms. Yvonne Johnson	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Ryan Jones	Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff

Ms. Haney opened the meeting by stating that the last meeting transpired in October 2011, under the ad hoc Pole Loading committee. Therefore, there was no need for review of prior meeting minutes.

Ms. Haney than announced that Mr. Hunter has presented the committee with an updated version of the DWP **Pole Anchor Load Technical Resource** job aide. This new version will be uploaded to the SCJPC.net webpage and override the current version. Mr. Hunter added that the spotter area map will be updated and also be available on the committee website.

Ms. Haney reported that an action item from the prior meeting is

Mr. Chow to bring to the meeting the **SCE shell thickness request process**. Mr. Chow responded that he would be ready to present the data at the next meeting, which is the intrusive inspection data form, or send it to the members in preparation of the next meeting. This item is to be tabled at this time.

The second issue on the agenda is **Compliance with Routine Handbook**; this is a standing item and will remain open. However, Ms Haney stated that there is one item for discussion in regards to compliance and this is **multiple correction JPAs**, which was brought to this committee from the Routine Revision as hoc committee for further discussion. Ms. Hernandez opened by stating that the cause of multiple correction JPAs is due to the inspections where other members have discovered out of grade record. She added that in these instances there is no need for a correcting JPA, but rather initiate a Correction of Record separate JPA per section 13.3 if the rearrangement of grade is per field condition. The consensus is if the billing is impacted, then a "COR" JPA could be initiated.

Lastly, the members discussed **miscellaneous** issues:

#### *Inspection Contact List*

Next, Ms. Haney opened discussion on the inspection contact list. She stated that she has provided the JPC office with an updated list to be uploaded to the SCJPC.net website. She suggested that members should review the list to ensure that their respective inspection contact information is up to date. Ms. Corella will be sending a reminder to members to review the current list to ensure the information is correct.

#### *Request for Pole Access*

Lastly, Ms. Haney opened discussion on discovering a utility on a pole in the space and grade that is designated to her organization and there is no tenant on record. Her organization contacted the unauthorized utility upon identification to inform them that they are out of grade, and who holds their lease agreement. She questioned if other members encounter this situation, and if they do, how they are handling it. Ms. Prescott responded that this issue is linked to the pole application process. What is needed is a process where members are able to share information in regards to pole applications. Mr. Chow stated that the member who the unauthorized utility has an agreement with must be identified and contacted. Mr. Eastwood added that it would be beneficial to create a centralized platform where members can share pole application information.

Ms. Haney stated the consensus is to create a process to share pole application/tenant information amongst members. She added she would start work on a process.

Ms. Prescott is of the opinion that it should become the responsibility of the pole applicants to notify joint owners of their intent. Mr. Chow added that SCE could make this a tenant responsibility; however, this would require giving tenants access to obtain this information. Ms. Prescott reiterated that all joint members on the pole(s) should be notified of the tenant's intent by either the joint owner or the tenant. Mr. Chow is of the opinion that a requirement for membership is that all members have a license lease process in place. Currently, there are only a few members who have this type process in place.

Again, Ms. Prescott suggested that it should be incumbent on the tenant applicant to notify all owners of a pole their intent. Mr. Chow inquired if the members would support creating a location on the SCJPC.net website allowing outside entities to obtain owner information from the JPC pole database. Mr. Hunter interjected that this would suffice only for jointly owned and not solely owned poles. He added that DWP allows outside entities to access their pole records for a fee. The members discussed possible risks to the database if outside entities are allowed access and what specific information would they be allowed access. Ms. Pranata interjected that they could be given a temporary pass code, and the allowance of only specific information would require special programming, which could be performed by Diamond Bar Web. Ms. Pranata added that an Excel spreadsheet could be sent to the JPC office and the pole information could be extrapolated from the JPC database and returned. It is agreed that tenant application notification should be shared amongst all owners by either the joint owner or the tenant. Mr. Hunter questioned where in the Routine the requirement is noted that joint owners must notify other joint owners that they have a tenant attaching to their space. All agreed there is not. However, it was agreed that this lack of notification amongst members is the core problem. Mr. Hunter added that DWP currently, does not have the resources to meet such a requirement.

Ms. Hernandez shared a situation where a JPA was final billed resulting in the tenant moving from one utility to another utility due to reallocation of space. She added that this JPA passed through the preliminary process without the error being corrected and creating an incorrect JPC pole record.

Mr. Chow stated that the consensus is the sharing of tenant information/transactions would be beneficial to members. Therefore, as a start to this concern, the ad hoc must identify what information requires sharing, and how this information is to be shared. He also inquired if members would prefer planning notification, or/and when the work is in progress which could lead to work coordination. He added that the "NJUNS" system demonstrated last year to the committee is a

program tailored to sharing this type information via notification. This could be an aide to the “make ready” process. Mr. Chow stated that the current pole process does not correspond with how business is practiced today, and therefore is in need of restructuring. Ms. Hernandez added that all member processes must be similar. Mr. Chow suggested that each member conduct their work and the last member utility to conduct their work on the pole is the responsible party; this member would warrant the pole for the life of the pole. He added that he believes most members would not agree to this process; however, if one wants to hold a party responsible, this method could work. He concluded that this has been a productive discussion on the topic of tenant request for access, and suggested that upon their return to their respective organizations discuss this issue internally for suggestions toward creating a tenant application communication process.

It was suggested that the JPC office be the centralized office for handling the request for access applications and the entity to communicate information to all joint members of the poles in question. There would be a fee attached to these requests. Mr. Hunter stated that this service would require self-support in that those members who do not have tenants or a lease license agreement process would not opt to share the operating costs to support this service. Therefore, it would require separate operating costs records. The consensus is that this topic requires further discussion; therefore **Item 1549: Pole Application Notification** has been assigned to this ad hoc committee.

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion on pole loading by stating that the CPUC is of the opinion that the SCJPC is the vehicle to police pole loading violations via communication amongst members. Ms. Haney interjected that the committee is not the enforcer of GO compliance. Mr. Chow responded that this is true; however, the perception of the CPSD is that the committee members should communicate loading violations, incompliance, and police one another. The CPUC understands that enforcement is their responsibility; however, their perception is that the committee should and always has policed one another in regards to pole loading compliance.

Ms. Hernandez furthered discussed pole loading stating that pole loading should be part of the tenant application process. She added that the CPUC currently believes that the monitoring of pole loading compliance should be a responsibility of the committee. Mr. Chow added that they are of the opinion that the committee should be the arena.

Ms. Haney stated that she would like it noted in the minutes that the SCJPC fully supports pole loading; however, the committee does not have the ability to enforce it. Ms. Hernandez interjected stating that the NCJPA has made it fully clear to the commission that they have the ability and authority to enforce pole loading compliance. This is in section six of the NCJPA Routine Handbook. To this end this ad hoc committee has been assigned **Item 1550: Pole Loading Discussion.**

Assigning this item to this committee is a sign of good faith that the SCJPC is proactive in addressing pole loading issues.

Review of action items:

- Members are to discuss the pole application request issue within their respective organizations to gain insight and provide suggestions for a process.
- Mr. Chow to provide members with the SCE Intrusive Inspection Data.
- Ms. Corella to send a request to all members to review the inspection list contact on the SCJPC website for accuracy.

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 pm, until April 10, 2012.

Jennie Corella - Manager of Operations

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

**\*REVISED\***

April 10, 2012

A meeting of the **Compliance ad hoc Committee** took place on the above date, at 10:10 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Dennis Ennis – T-Mobile USA  
Ms. Shawn Henderson – T-Mobile USA (teleconference)  
Ms. Tracey Province – Verizon California (teleconference)  
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Mr. Steve Brown – City of Los Angeles - DWP  
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (teleconference)  
Mr. Michael Wolf – AT&T California (teleconference)  
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility  
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath (teleconference)  
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services  
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)  
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff  
Mr. Ryan Jones – Committee Staff  
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Guest: Mr. Brett Willitt – SpidaWEB LLC.

The meeting opened with a presentation by Mr. Brett Willitt of SpidaWEB. He gave an overview of SpidaWEB and how they might work with the SCJPC to better improve current processes. He then gave a brief history of his organization and his personal background in the industry; then proceeded with the Spida software presentation. The product Mr. Willitt presented is an application titled, “Spida Min” which is a structured management system software. There are three areas in the management system; they are construction coordination, engineering and planning, and inspection and maintenance. The second application Mr. Willitt presented is Spida CALC which interfaces with SpidaMIN. SpidaCALC addresses pole loading, pole strength, clearances, and data

collection. Mr. Willitt demonstrated the different functions and capabilities of SpidaMIN, and answered questions posed by the members.

Upon completion of the SpidaWEB demonstration, Ms. Haney thanked Mr. Willitt for the presentation and his time. She then addressed the agenda.

The first issue on the agenda is the review of the prior month's minutes. There were no questions or comments on the minutes.

The second issue on the agenda is **Compliance with Routine Handbook**. This is a standing agenda item. There was no discussion on this issue.

The third issue on the agenda is **Pole Application Notification**. This issue will be tabled at this time until Mr. Wolf is in attendance.

The fourth issue on the agenda is the **Pole Loading Discussion**. This committee wishes to be proactive in regards to the CPUC and the pole loading communication amongst members. The members briefly discussed the SpidaWEB demonstration and the consensus is that this software application might be the tool to aid in pole loading discussion and the sharing of information.

Lastly, the members discussed **miscellaneous** issues. **Item 1551: Database Research** has been assigned to this committee for further discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 am, until May 8, 2012.

Jennie Corella - Manager of Operations

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE**  
**1400 Montefino Ave., Suite 100**  
**Diamond Bar, CA 91765**  
**Phone (909) 348-5920**

**May 8, 2012**

**A meeting of the Compliance Committee took place on the above date, at 12:55 p.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:**

Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services  
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Mr. Steve Brown – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network  
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Mr. Michael Wolf – AT&T California  
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath  
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility  
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel  
Mr. Shawn Henderson– T-Mobile USA (teleconference)  
Mr. Jay Mingus – AT&T California  
Ms. Tracey Province – Verizon California  
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff  
Mr. Ryan Jones – Committee Staff  
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Haney opened the meeting by referencing last month's minutes, inquiring if any changes needed to be made, Ms. Smith Stated that on the second page where it said the first issue should read fourth issue on the agenda for pole loading.

The second item on the agenda was Item **1549: Pole Application Notification**. Ms. Haney opened up discussion regarding SPIDA inquiring if any of the other members had any further thoughts on the presentation from the previous Compliance Meeting. Ms. Prescott questioned if the need is to alert pole owners when a tenant attaches to a pole, would SPIDA really be necessary? She added that it would be a possibility that the tenant attaching to the pole be required to find out what owners are on the pole and to notify the owners that a tenant is attaching. Mr. Chow stated that he was of the opinion that SPIDA would be beneficial if it were able to pry information out of SAP making that information viewable to other members. He added that it would become problematic to get a strand map or make ready for every application that Edison receives. Ms. Prescott suggested that the tenant be responsible for

communicating to the owners that an attachment is taking place and the tenant would be responsible for sending out strand maps to all owners of said pole. Mr. Wolf was of the opinion that SPIDA could possibly solve the issue of notification, but believes that there are too many "process issues" that would keep it from working as envisioned. Mr. Wolf gave an example; any member trying to keep records of the current loads on poles would become obsolete very quickly because other members are not aware of what is going on in other member's space and grade, or the latest intrusive inspections results, or that fact that each utility loads slightly differently. Mr. Wolf suggested a third party handle the pole loading for the committee. Mr. Wolf noted that it would be similar to "Call before you Dig" it would be "Call before you Attach." Mr. Wolf further explained that the Members are all trying to get to the current and true stated of a pole. By doing so he stated that members are taking different avenues and coming up with different results. With this being the current case Utilities will be in disagreement over the results causing further delays. Mr. Wolf stated that if a third party were set up doing the calculations once, and if set up as a "Call before you Attach" type entity where no work can be done before going through this process that entity could then maintain a real-time database of any given pole. He added that the Commission is still being very hard on their Pole Loading calculations, and that no matter what software is used, it's expensive to get engineers to be good at. Mr. Wolf also stated that this would be the long term fix and that there should and could be some things done in the short term but if the committee could commit to something like this initiated. Mr. Chow stated that he was in favor of the idea and stated that the Commission would be in favor of committee unifying the pole load calculation process. He added that the entity would have to be flexible enough to accommodate Edison's unique process. Mr. Wolf stated that part of the current frustration with the current process is the time and finances that go into training for pole loading under the current provisions, with Section 4 on the Commission's agenda the third party entity would benefit the Committee. Mr. Chow is of the belief that the technology is available, and no matter what program is chosen it will be necessary for that program to be able to communicate on different platforms. Ms. Prescott presented an issue if a third party were to be the housing location for the wind and pole loading information, how would it be regulated to request information from the third party? With all Members having different deadlines a situation is created with one entity having all the information and all the Members have to go through them to get their work done. Ms. Prescott also question would this be a matter of first come first sever? Would companies be willing to pay an expedite fee? She was of the opinions that this would be difficult to maintain a level playing field, and time to market. Ms. Prescott also stated that this third party should come with some service level commitment and be liable for the poles. Mr. Chow stated that if the entity was funded by the Committee it would be a mutual benefit nonprofit cooperation. Mr. Chow referenced Dig Alert, in which they are 100% responsible if they have any discrepancies Dig Alert is financially responsible for them. Mr. Wolf suggested that a service level agreement would dictate the time to market and how quickly information could be retrieved. Mr. Wolf also stated that once the Committee has started this *Mutual Pole Analysis* (MPA) database of pole loads, now when you go back to that pole and it doesn't need to be calculated from scratch. Ms. Prescott added that this would be the case so long as it is known that a tenant hasn't attached or over lashed. Mr. Wolf agreed, adding that companies trying to solve this problem on their own aren't working because of such problems. He added

“Call before you Dig” is the closest thing to a fact check that he has seen as of now and if there would be this type of commitment to the process to a “Call before your Attach” type implementation we could ensure accurate and up to date information. Ms. Prescott suggested that as a start accumulating all pole loading information and adding that to a depository under that pole number with a date. This way anyone could utilize this information for what it’s worth. Mr. Ennis stated that in some instances the construction depends on the pole loading, so the pole is going to need to be loaded before a job can be designed. Mr. Wolf stated that if the entity is set up in a way where it has that database in which you can access that last loaded pole you would have a starting point available instantly. Ms. Prescott suggested members populate each pole in their databases, give space but within that space, grade of attachment, diameter of cable, and any equipment making all the pole information available on the pole records. She argued that this would allow one to pull wind loading information as well. Mr. Wolf Stated that if there was some interest that he would like to start putting together a business case to further launch the process. He continued, every time the Commission tries to head off a problem it creates 10 more, he stressed the fact that he doesn’t want them mandating more operational issues. Mr. Chow stated that he was of the opinion that the Committee needed 2-3 things that the Committee believes in as a consensus that the Commission would hear from all of the organizations. He continued that the Commission tends to stay away from topic in which all organizations agree. Mr. Chow stated one of the specific points of interest Edison had is there a willingness among member to make it part of the routine to share pole loading information? Mr. Wolf Stated that his company has had a corporate mandate imposed where they have to run load calculations on all poles set including those set by others, and they cannot simply accept another members calculations. Mr. Wolf stated that if the Committee had a *Mutual Pole Analysis* type process and you have someone attaching, and it was agreed coming in that all would agree with the MPA results it would make it much more of an efficient process. Ms. Hernandez was in favor of Mr. Wolf’s idea and questioned what the next step would be. She also was of the opinion that the Committee should not wait on the Commission final result on phase three as it would be a waste of time. Mr. Wolf stated that if the Commission stayed relevant to section 4 and how loading is done and not so much on when and communication then it’s a matter of having the MPA engineers adapting the software or making slight adjustments to the calculator. Mr. Wolf stated that the committee should put together a case and compute the numbers to see if this would be a beneficial investment. Ms. Haney Stated that the Committee would then have to agree upon what they want, and also something of this magnitude usually requires a buy-in for the larger companies. She continued if one of the major companies will not buy in this premise wouldn’t work. Ms. Prescott suggested that there be a server set up where PDF can be uploaded of the wind load for whoever wants to view that information. Information such as pole number, what company it is, and what year it was done. Mr. Chow stated that there was going to be a transitioning period; he is of the opinion that this date will be implemented and from that point on all poles will go through the entity then on. He then questioned what will happen to the poles before the cutoff date? Mr. Chow also stated that the second part of creating this entity is creating centralized server as a stop gap. Ms. Prescott suggested that if attaching to a pole attaching party must submit PDF of their wind loads as a starting point as well. Ms. Haney suggested that the Committee reopen the discussion on FTP sites. Ms. Prescott agreed, and

added that this is a quick and proactive short term solution to attachments. She also made the point that there is too much information sent back a forth to not have it in one central location allowing companies to be proactive with their work. Mr. Ennis stated that with the amount of information we will be uploading onto the FTP site that a company could customize the site based on our specific needs. Ms. Pranata suggested creating a program for the uploading process, naming the file and specifying what it is that is being uploaded. Ms. Prescott requested that Ms. Pranata update the FTP site costs list for the next meeting.

## **Miscellaneous**

### **GO 95 Contact list**

Mr. Wolf opened discussion requesting that the GO95 notification contact list be moved to the public side of the website. He reasoned that if a citizen or code enforcement agent views a low handing drop and opts to come to the SCJPC website they would find the correct person of contact. Mr. Wolf stated that the list would not need addresses or even names, just a number to call. Ms. Pranata argued that there is an emergency number that is available on the public side. Mr. Chow stated that they are services centers that aren't in the city in which they are listed and suggest that their contact may have to go to their default number. Ms. Haney stated that all members should look at their contact list for GO95 and make sure all contacts are up to date.

#### Review of Action Items:

- Item 1549: Pole Application Notification
- Item 1550: Pole Loading Discussion
- Item 1552: Cut and Kick

The Meeting Adjourned at 1:50 p.m., until June 2012

Ryan Jones SCJPC Staff

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE**  
**279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104**  
**San Dimas, CA 91773**  
**Phone (909) 599-3801**

**June 12, 2012**

A meeting of the Compliance Committee took place on the above date, at 1:10 p.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services  
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Mr. Steve Brown – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Mr. Michael Wolf – AT&T California (teleconference)  
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath  
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility  
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)  
Ms. Shawn Henderson – T-Mobile USA  
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (Teleconference)  
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff  
Mr. Ryan Jones – Committee Staff  
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff  
Mr. Kyle Levy – Committee Staff

Ms. Haney opened the meeting by referencing last month's minutes, inquiring if any changes needed to be made. There were no questions or issues at this time.

The second item on the agenda was **Item 1549: Pole Application Notification**. Ms. Haney reopened discussion on the subject of notification of tenant attaching or adding to space on a pole. The consensus is to continue researching different avenues to live-time update application. Ms. Haney requested that this topic be tabled for the next compliance meeting.

The third item on the agenda was **item 1550: Pole Loading Discussion**. Ms. Haney stated that is was a standing item and was to be discussed at every meeting. She continued that this was a discussion to try and determine a specific program for a Mutual Pole Analysis system that would work for all of the Members. The consensus is that most of the Members are using OCALC for pole load calculations. Ms. Haney requested that Ms. Pranata canvass all committee members about their willingness to share pole loading field work calculations upon request. Also to know what programs organizations are currently using to calculate pole loading (see attached). It was agreed to table this topic for the next Compliance meeting.

The fourth item on the agenda was **item 1551: Database Research**. Ms. Haney opened by inquiring if Ms. Pranata was able to locate prices for a FTP sites. Ms. Pranata stated that she began the research of FTP databases but because of the Committee staff's move to the new office was unable to complete the list of sites. It was agreed to table this topic for next month's meeting to give Ms. Pranata sufficient time to complete the research.

The fifth item on the agenda was item 1552: Cut and Kick. Ms. Haney stated that this item did not belong in the compliance meeting. It was agreed that this be deleted from the compliance agenda, and moved to the routine meeting agenda.

### **Miscellaneous**

Ms. Haney inquired if there were any miscellaneous items for discussion. There were none at the moment.

#### Review of Action Items:

- Ms. Pranata to email a query to see members willingness to share pole loading information
- Updated list/prices for FTP sited

The Meeting Adjourned at 1:45p.m., until July 2012

Ryan Jones SCJPC Staff

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE**  
**279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104**  
**San Dimas, CA 91773**  
**Phone (909) 599-3801**

**July 10, 2012**

A meeting of the Compliance Committee took place on the above date, at 10:25 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services  
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Adolph Gonzales – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath  
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility  
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)  
Ms. Shawn Henderson – T-Mobile USA (teleconference)  
Ms. Tracey Province – Verizon California (Teleconference)  
Mr. David Cheney – (teleconference)  
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff  
Mr. Ryan Jones – Committee Staff  
Mr. Kyle Levy – Committee Staff

Ms. Haney opened the meeting by referencing last month's minutes, inquiring if any changes needed to be made. There were no questions or issues at this time.

The second item on the agenda was **Compliance with Routine handbook**. This is a standing agenda item. Mr. Chow inquired about use of section 7.13 on a pole removal where the JPA has been submitted but the pole is being removed prior to the 45 day review period. He further stated that the pole was removed because none of the other member had and facilities on said poles. Mr. Chow presented a second issue of when a multiple page JPA is returned with approval only the first page is being returned. It was agreed that Mr. Levy would create a JPA alert reminding members of the correct process.

The third item on the agenda was **item 1549: Pole Application Notification**. Ms. Haney reopened discussion on the subject of notification of a tenant attaching or adding space on a pole. Ms. Prescott stated that tenants are attaching to poles without notification to owners and this is not being noticed until further work is done on the pole. It was agreed that this information would be necessary to make pole loading information current. It was suggested that if the tenant was able to upload the pole loading information there would need to be a way to track that this information was complete and provided correctly by the tenant. It was determined by the

members that the SCJPC office would be the proper housing location for a notification program. Ms. Haney then presented a situation where one of Edison's tenants was attached to a communication anchor. Mr. Eastwood stated that Edison's tenants have been instructed to not attach to any anchors in the field, they will need to place their own. The consensus was to table this topic for the next Compliance meeting.

The fourth item on the agenda was **item 1550: Pole Loading Discussion**. Ms. Haney stated that this was a standing agenda item and was to be discussed at every meeting. Ms. Haney stated this discussion was to further explore the idea of a Mutual Pole Analysis database to keep current calculations of pole loading. It was agreed that this topic be tabled for the next compliance meeting.

The fifth item on the agenda was **item 1551: Database Research**. Ms. Haney opened discussion inquiring if Ms. Pranata was able to obtain a list of FTP sites. Ms. Pranata presented the members with a list of Database sites (see attached). She further explained the Sharefile software where she gave a brief demonstration. Ms. Prescott inquired about working on a more in depth demonstration utilizing some of the specific features and functions offered by the software. It was agreed that Ms. Prescott and Ms. Pranata would work together to create a more detailed demonstration.

Lastly, the members discussed **miscellaneous** issues:

#### *Non-owner Notifications*

Ms. Haney inquired if there were any miscellaneous items for discussion. Mr. Chow presented the issue of Guying or pole loading deficiencies found in the normal course of business and not associated to an inspection as specified in rule 18. Mr. Chow stated that if the planner found that the communication anchor is overloaded or the guying is inadequate, that this is something that he would not follow the rule 18 notification processes for. He further stated that the CPUC would like the Members to come up with a different notification form. It was agreed that this new form would still go through the same contact points as it would with the rule 18 process. It was also agreed that a form would be created for notification of non-owners under section 17. The consensus was to further discuss this under **Item 1556: Violation of Routine Notification** at the Routine Revision meeting.

#### *Standards*

Ms. Haney brought up a situation of Edison's internal standards have changing and other utilities not being notified of the causing more delay on work. Mr. Eastwood stated that this issue has been identified and they are in the process of rectifying the issue. It was suggested that prior to writing up a job, a planner be contacted to make sure the standards being used are up to date and current. Ms. Hernandez inquired if it was possible to deny a JPA on standards that were not yet published. Mr. Eastwood informed the members that yes a JPA can be denied because of standards not yet published.

Compliance – July 10, 2012

Review of Action Items:

- Ms. Pranata and Ms. Prescott to work on demonstration of Sharefile
- Item 1556: Notifications ( Routine Revision)

The Meeting Adjourned at 12:15p.m., until August 2012

Ryan Jones SCJPC Staff

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE**  
**279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104**  
**San Dimas, CA 91773**  
**Phone (909) 599-3801**

**August 14, 2012**

A meeting of the Compliance Committee took place on the above date, at 10:45 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services  
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Mr. Steve Brown – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless (teleconference)  
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California  
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath  
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility  
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)  
Ms. Jennifer Navarro – (teleconference)  
Ms. Tracey Provence – Verizon California  
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff  
Mr. Ryan Jones – Committee Staff  
Mr. Kyle Levy – Committee Staff

Ms. Haney opened the meeting by referencing last month's minutes, inquiring if there were comments or any changes needed to be made. There were no questions or issues at this time.

The second item on the agenda was **Compliance with Routine handbook**. Ms. Haney stated that this was a standing agenda item and to be discussed at every Compliance meeting. She inquired if any of the members had any questions, there were none. It was agreed to discuss this item at the next meeting.

The third item on the agenda was **item 1549: Pole Application Notification**. Ms. Haney reopened discussion on the subject of notification of a tenant attaching or adding space on a pole. Ms. Hernandez reminded members of the issue of Edison being able to dictate to a tenant to provide the pole loading information when said tenant applies. Mr. Chow stated that getting tenants to submit an electronic copy of all information should not be an issue. However, Mr. Chow did state that Edison is questioning if there would be a legal issue of responsibility under their licensed agreement to not let certain information out. He continued, stating there is information that would be asked of the tenant to be uploaded that potentially could be proprietary

to the tenant. Ms. Pranata notified the members that Sprint Communications isn't willing to share pole loading information calculations but is willing to share results as per the request sent out via email. The consensus was for the organizations with legal departments to receive input on the owner's responsibilities to the tenant.

The fourth item on the agenda was **item 1550: Pole Loading Discussion**. Ms. Haney stated that this was a standing agenda item and was to be discussed at every meeting. Ms. Haney stated this discussion was to further explore the idea of a Mutual Pole Analysis database. Ms. Haney requested any members whom have not replied to Ms. Pranata's pole loading information request to please do so. Mr. Chow suggested that if the intent was to share information between the members, that the information shared should be documented. He further explained that it should be formally documented in the routine handbook or in the meeting minutes that the members agree to sharing information. The members agreed that this topic be table for the next meeting.

The fifth item on the agenda was **item 1551: Database Research**. Ms. Haney opened discussion regarding using Sharefile as the database to house the pole loading information. Ms. Haney suggested that prior to beginning service each member would need to verify with their companies to find out how each organization will use the database. She also noted organizations would need to discuss what exact information they would like to store in the database. Mr. Chow questioned the validity of the records kept in the database, stating that poles could be changed multiple times before noticed. It was agreed that if used, there would need to be some sort of disclaimer stating work "reflected as of" date. Ms. Hernandez suggested using the ShareFile strictly for member's pole loading needs until the legality issues for the tenants is resolved. It was agreed that this be moved to discussions on the Administrative Board meeting agenda and to be voted on in the next Administrative Board meeting.

Lastly, the members discussed **miscellaneous** issues:

*Third Party Pole Loading Entity*

Ms. Hernandez presented a situation where a pole application had been submitted, and then a month later a tenant application was submitted how would the pole loading information stay current and accurate because the tenant hasn't begun construction. Mr. Chow stated that this would be an issue; he suggested something similar to U.S.A. where a single organization houses this information. He further explained that this organization would potentially be responsible for pole loading calculation. He then stated that Edison wouldn't be very tolerant to the idea of trusting a 3<sup>rd</sup> party calculating pole loading. It was agreed that this be discussed within the Administrative board meeting to query the other member's interest in a third party pole loading entity.

*September Compliance Meeting*

Ms. Haney brought notified the committee that she will be unable to attend the next compliance meeting. She stated the next meeting will be set for 60 day barring any discrepancies in which the meetings will follow the schedule as usual.

Review of Action Items:

- Item 1551: Moved to Administrative Board discussion
- Ms. Pranata to contact Spring Communications to find what they will/won't provide
- Add Item 1550: Pole loading Discussion to Routine Meeting agenda
- Change Item 1549 to : Tenant pole Application Notification
- Check with legal departments on legality of Pole Application Notifications of tenants

The Meeting Adjourned at 12:10p.m., until September 11, 2012

Ryan Jones SCJPC Staff

## Pole Loading Information Sharing

Company	Yes	No	Program	Notes
NextG Networks	X			
Telepacific (Mpower)	X			No app inhouse. Use K&B or CES.
City of Lompoc	X		O-Calc Pro v4.06	
City of Los Angeles, DWP	X		O-Calc Pro	
Verizon California			O-Calc	I'd like to hear the conversation and specifically what it means about sharing information before I respond. But anytime we can share information and have it accessible to everyone is a good thing and I am in support of that. (T.Province)
AT&T Local Services	X			
Newpath Networks	X		O-Calc	
CA-CLEC	X		O-Calc	
AT&T Mobility	X		O-Calc	
Sprint Communications LP		X		I believe that it is reasonable to agree as an organization to share the results of pole loading calculations overtly. I do not support sharing the underlying science as it would be subject to discovery and would leave the membership of the SCJPC open to undue legal complications. I also would support having a PE stamp on the engineered drawings that show the pole requirements and results of the calculations. I have no problem sharing results. I do not believe that it is wise to share the underlying information. No matter how good it is, it will come back to haunt the members in contexts that we do not anticipate in the future. If the membership is forced to share more than results, then I believe that the stakeholders have an interest in sharing only that which is clearly mandated. In other words, I do not want to share the calculations. That information and the associated liabilities should reside with the engineer performing the calculations. (T.Laky).
Southern California Edison	X			As long as member's issues and concerns can be addressed.
MetroPCS	X			No app inhouse. Use structural engineering firm.

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE**  
**279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104**  
**San Dimas, CA 91773**  
**Phone (909) 599-3801**

**September 11, 2012**

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

Ms. Debbie Wooten – NextG Network  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services  
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Mark Yip – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Ms. Shawn Henderson – T-Mobile USA  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California  
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath  
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility  
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)  
Ms. Jennifer Navarro – (teleconference)  
Mr. Michael Wolf – AT&T California (teleconference)  
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff  
Mr. Ryan Jones – Committee Staff  
Mr. Kyle Levy – Committee Staff

Ms. Wooten opened the meeting by referencing last month's minutes, inquiring if there were comments or any changes that needed to be made. There were no questions or issues at the time.

The second item on the agenda was **Compliance with Routine handbook**. Ms. Wooten stated that this was a standing agenda item and to be discussed at every Compliance meeting. She inquired if any of the members had any questions, there were none. It was agreed to discuss this item at the next meeting.

The third item on the agenda was **item 1549: Tenant Pole Application Notification**. Ms. Wooten reopened discussion on the subject of notification of a tenant attaching or adding space on a pole. Mr. Chow reported that Edison's legal department didn't find any issue with sharing tenants RFA's with other members, but suggested sharing grade and space information but not the name of the tenant. Mr. Chow stated that the tenant submits the information needed such as pole loading information, grade of attachment etc. but not the name.

The fourth item on the agenda was **item 1550: Pole Loading Discussion**. Mr. Chow reported that he has been working with Mr. Mark Yip with regards to pole loading programs. He stated the goal is to try and find commonalities making it easier to be more aligned as members in the calculating process. Mr. Yip's presented ideas of how Edison plans to streamline the pole loading calculations (see attached). He further explained that members would be able access to historical records of loading information past from a centralized location. Mr. Chow stated that the CPUC inquired why the numbers are different from company to company. Mr. Chow explained that the first problem is the variables and not knowing what those exact values are. He further explained that the CPUC expects Edison to start the process but over time hopes to have the database housed at the SCJPC office. Mr. Chow asked Ms. Pranata to query the other members to provide the names and versions of programs other Members are using for pole calculations, as well as subject matter expert contact information.

The fifth item on the agenda was **item 1551: Database Research**. Ms. Wooten opened discussion regarding using Sharefile as the database to house the pole loading information. Mr. Wolf inquired about not having total consensus amongst the members on using the ShareFile and what information would be shared. Ms. Prescott was of the opinion that if a member was not willing to use the Sharefile database that member would not receive a password. Mr. Wolf suggested uploading the actual data files versus the summary reports because more information is included, making corrections faster and easier to communicate. It was agreed that this item be changed to **Database Research/Sharefile** and to be discussed at next meeting.

There were no **Miscellaneous** issues.

Review of Action Items:

- Ms. Pranata to send email to Members asking to complete the excel spreadsheet

The Meeting Adjourned at 9:45a.m., until October 10, 2012

Ryan Jones SCJPC Staff

# ***Pole Loading Utility Strategy (PLUS)***

## September 2012

# PLUS Concept

- Develop an integrated pole loading approach
  - Impetus
    - ▶ Malibu Canyon Fire
    - ▶ Monrovia Wind Storm
    - ▶ CPUC, CPSD, GO 95
  
  - Provide a consistent process for sharing
    - ▶ Tension Values
    - ▶ Cable and Conductor Sizes
    - ▶ Algorithms and Calculations

# PLUS Next Steps

- Data Sharing

- Default tension values and cable / conductor sizes with SCJPC
  - Compile and consolidate a single list
  - Present these values to SCJPC for review
  - SCJPC to agree on standard values
- Historical pole loading asset data

- Pole Loading

- Algorithms and Calculations
- Consistent output given same data inputs

# PLUS Summary

- A single list of tension values and cable / conductor sizes for your Pole Loading software / process
- Process for sharing pole loading data with SCJPC
  - Tension values
  - Cable and Conductor sizes
  - Asset data
- Consistent Pole loading output based on calculations and algorithms
- Is not meant to replace your current process!

# Questions?

[Mark.Yip@sce.com](mailto:Mark.Yip@sce.com)

Office 909-274-3524

Cell 626-800-7820

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE**  
**279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104**  
**San Dimas, CA 91773**  
**Phone (909) 599-3801**

**October 10, 2012**

A meeting of the Compliance Committee took place on the above date, at 10:00 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services  
Ms. Shawn Henderson– T-Mobile USA  
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison  
Mr. James Eastwood – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network  
Ms. Debbie Wooten – NextG Network  
Ms. Amy Parker – NextG Networks  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless (teleconference)  
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath  
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility  
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)  
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California  
Ms. Tracey Province – Verizon California  
Ms. Jennifer Navarro – (teleconference)  
Ms. Angela Pranata – SCJPC Staff  
Mr. Kyle Levy – SCJPC Staff  
Mr. Ryan Jones – SCJPC Staff

Ms. Haney opened the meeting by referencing last month's minutes, inquiring if there were comments or any changes that needed to be made. There were no questions or issues at the time.

The second item on the agenda was **Compliance with Routine handbook**. Ms. Haney stated that this was a standing agenda item and to be discussed at every Compliance meeting. She inquired if any of the members had any questions, there were none. It was agreed that this item be tabled until the next Compliance meeting.

The third item on the agenda was **item 1549: Tenant Pole Application Notification**. Ms. Haney reopened discussion on the subject of notification of a tenant attaching or adding space on a pole. Mr. Chow stated that the most of the work for this item was to be done in the Computer meetings to find file format and what requirements were going to be needed from members. It was agreed that this item stay tabled until all the components are completed from the computer meetings.

The fourth item on the agenda was **item 1550: Pole Loading Discussion**. Ms. Haney reopened discussion on pole loading inquiring how the members received the presentation from Mr. Mark Yip from last month's meeting. Mr. Chow reported that about 40% of the members responded with tension values, cable sizes etc. Mr. Chows reiterated that this was intended to differentiate what the table values are based on programs to try and create on one common value. Mr. Chow stated that Edison will try and contact those members whom have not replied. Ms. Prescott stated that she had a hard time listing an "subject matter expert" contact for pole loading information stating that she had experts on both the program and G.O. 95 in the field. Mr. Chow clarified for the members by stating the person subject matter expert contact should be the person who would have the most knowledge from the pole loading programs table values. It was agreed that this item be table for the next Compliance meeting.

The last item on the agenda was **Miscellaneous** issues.

*Maintenance Program: Pole Inspections 12A visual only inspections.*

Ms. Chirrick inquired about a situation regarding 12A stating that she had received JPAs that had poles that were being inspected annually and being charged the 12A. Ms. Hernandez inquired if this was a Powers company's mandate. Mr. Chow stated anything that is charged 12A-E is should be in compliance with G.O. 95 rule. Ms. Chirrick inquired how anyone was able to differentiate if 12A is being charged during an intrusive inspection or an annual inspection. Mr. Chow stated that the Committee office had a copy of Edison's MS454 which dictates what can be billed during an intrusive inspection. Ms. Chirrick questioned the validity of the 12A charge stating it will have to be viewed regardless before any other inspections began. It was agreed to assign **item 1560: 12A Visual Only Inspection Removal** to the Authorized Costs Agenda for further discussion.

*Review of Action Items:*

- Provide Pole Loading Discussion point of contact

The Meeting Adjourned at 10:30 a.m., until November 13, 2012

Ryan Jones SCJPC Staff'