

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

January 14th, 2014

A meeting of the Compliance Committee took place on the above date, at 12:00 p.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Mr. James Eastwood | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Jessica Pearson | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Larry Chow | Southern California Edison |
| Ms. Marcela Zapien | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Scott Hunter | City of Los Angeles |
| Ms. Paula Haney | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Lynn Prescott | Verizon Wireless |
| Ms. Lupe Hernandez | Teleport Communications America |
| Ms. Yvonne Johnson | AT&T Mobility |
| Mr. William Kerns | Verizon Ca, MCI / COMM / Metro |
| Mr. Josh Mathisen | AT&T California |
| Mr. Paul Smolarski | T-mobile USA |
| Ms. Angela Pranata | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Kyle Levy | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Ryan Jones | SCJPC Staff |

Those attending via teleconference were:

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Ms. Alicia Smith | Sprint/Nextel Sprint Communications |
| Ms. Maria Ortiz | XO Communication |
| Mr. Joe Serrato | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |

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 none at the time.

The second item on the agenda was **Compliance with Routine handbook**. Ms. Haney stated this was a standing agenda item and to be discussed at every Compliance meeting. Ms. Haney inquired if members had any questions or concerns regarding compliance of the Routine Handbook. Ms. Haney presented an issue with receiving JPAs requesting a joint meet in the field to from members with no contact information. Ms. Haney requested a JPA Alert be created reminding members that all joint meet request must have name and phone number. Ms. Haney presented an issue of receiving JPAs where the issuer is showing transfers of "com" or "TV." Ms. Haney stated the issuer of the JPA must be more specific on who and what is being transferred. The members agreed to create a JPA Alert reminding members the correct process for the transfer of cables and arms. The members agreed to table this item until the next Compliance meeting.

The third item on the agenda was **item 1571: Tree trimming at Communication Level**. Ms. Haney requested to table this item until the next Compliance meeting.

The last item on the agenda was **Miscellaneous** issues. There were none.

Review of Action Items:

- Mr. Levy to create JPA Alert reminding members to include a contact name and phone number when requesting joint meets
- Mr. Levy to create JPA Alert notifying members of the correct process of transfers of cables or arms.

The Meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m. until November 19, 2013.

Ryan Jones SCJPC Staff

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

March 18th, 2014

A meeting of the Compliance Committee took place on the above date, at 9:30 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Mr. James Eastwood | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Adolph Gonzales | Southern California Edison |
| Ms. Patricia Chaves-Silva | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Larry Chow | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Wayne Brown | Southern California Edison |
| Ms. Dawn Worthy | Southern California Edison |
| Ms. Jessica Pearson | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Steve Brown | City of Los Angeles |
| Mr. Jeff Williams | City of Los Angeles |
| Ms. Paula Haney | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Lynn Prescott | Verizon Wireless |
| Ms. Lupe Hernandez | Teleport Communications America |
| Ms. Yvonne Johnson | AT&T Mobility |
| Ms. Maria Ortiz | XO Communication |
| Mr. William Kerns | Verizon Ca, MCI / COMM / Metro |
| Mr. Rory Gandy | AT&T Mobility |
| Ms. Kourtney Wietecha | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Mr. David Elston | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Mr. Josh Mathisen | AT&T California |
| Mr. Paul Smolarski | T-mobile USA |
| Ms. Angela Pranata | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Kyle Levy | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Ryan Jones | SCJPC Staff |

Those attending via teleconference were:

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Ms. Alicia Smith | Sprint/Nextel Sprint Communications |
| Mr. Stephen Pebley | Frontier Communications |
| Ms. Lily Tran | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Mr. Joe Serrato | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Tracey Province | Verizon Ca, MCI / COMM / Metro |

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 none at the time.

The second item on the agenda was **Compliance with Routine handbook**. Ms. Haney stated this was a standing agenda item and to be discussed at every Compliance meeting. Ms. Haney inquired if members had any questions or concerns regarding compliance of the Routine Handbook. Ms. Haney presented an issue with receiving JPAs requesting a joint meet in the field to from members with no contact information. Ms. Haney requested a JPA Alert be created reminding members that all joint meet request must have name and phone number. Ms. Haney presented an issue of receiving JPAs where the issuer is showing transfers of “com” or “TV.” Ms. Haney stated the issuer of the JPA must be more specific on who and what is being transferred. The members agreed to create a JPA Alert reminding members the correct process for the transfer of cables and arms. The members agreed to table this item until the next Compliance meeting.

The third item on the agenda was **item 1571: Tree trimming at Communication Level**. Ms. Haney reported a JPA would be created using section 1.2 to recover costs such as permits, traffic control, and tree trimming. Ms. Haney instructed members to notify herself or Ms. Prescott if these JPAs should go to specific contact point. After discussion the members agreed to table this discussion until the next Compliance meeting.

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

Mr. Brown presented an issue of a lot being constructed and the owners agreeing to give DWP a 5’ unobstructed path along the right property line. He continued, stating the current location of the pole was between 2 walls making it very difficult to get to the pole. Mr. Brown sent an advanced JPA to the other owner and received a response to top the pole and relinquish interest. Brown noted the other owner would rather place another pole next to the old pole. He made the point if DWP set a pole and relinquished interest in the old pole it would be an interset pole. Mr. Brown stated DWP would have to pay for the other member to transfer onto the new pole and DWP could not collect costs of items 5C and 9A. Mr. Brown stated although the minimum distance between poles is 6’ he believes the members should work together to rectify the issue with 1 pole. Mr. Mathisen suggested a notation be included for this JPA indicating to not charge this pole as an interset pole. After discussion the members agreed to table this item.

The members discussed the NJUNS notification program. Mr. Mathisen believes this is a good platform to share a multitude of functions for the committee. Mr. Mathisen referenced pole loading, maps, and Rule 18 notifications as a few functions the committed would find useful. Ms. Prescott believes NJUNS could work for inspections and notifications but not pole loading. After extensive discussion the members agreed to table this subject for further discussion.

Review of Action Items:

- Ms. Haney to forward information to interested parties regarding Tree trimming project
- Revisit DWP interset pole situation

The Meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m. until April 15, 2014.

Compliance – March 18, 2014

Ryan Jones SCJPC Staff

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

April 15th, 2014

A meeting of the Compliance Committee took place on the above date, at 9:30 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Mr. James Eastwood | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Jeff Klarich | Southern California Edison |
| Ms. Jessica Pearson | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Larry Chow | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Wayne Brown | Southern California Edison |
| Ms. Catalina Bohorques | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Steve Brown | City of Los Angeles |
| Ms. Lynn Prescott | Verizon Wireless |
| Ms. Lupe Hernandez | Teleport Communications America |
| Ms. Yvonne Johnson | AT&T Mobility |
| Ms. Maria Ortiz | XO Communication |
| Mr. William Kerns | Verizon Ca, MCI / COMM / Metro |
| Ms. Kourtney Wietecha | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Angela Pranata | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Kyle Levy | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Ryan Jones | SCJPC Staff |

Those attending via teleconference were:

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Ms. Alicia Smith | Sprint/Nextel Sprint Communications |
| Mr. Josh Mathisen | AT&T California |
| Ms. Janet Chirrick | AT&T California |
| Mr. Jeff Williams | City of Los Angeles |
| Mr. Joe Serrato | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |

Ms. Wietecha opened the meeting by notifying members that Ms. Haney was unable to attend and that she would be leading this meeting. Ms. Wietecha inquired if members had any questions or concerns regarding the last month's meeting. There were none at the time.

The second item on the agenda was **Compliance with Routine handbook**. Ms. Wietecha stated this was a standing agenda item and to be discussed at every Compliance meeting. Ms. Wietecha inquired if members had any questions or concerns. There were none. The members agreed to table this item until the next Compliance meeting.

The third item on the agenda was **item 1571: Tree trimming at Communication Level**. Ms. Wietcha reported Ms. Haney was still working on this and requested that this item be tabled for the next Compliance meeting.

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

Mr. Eastwood introduced Mr. Jeff Klarich of Edison to speak to the members about a standardized third party notification system. Mr. Klarich stated it was Edison's goal to streamline and make the process more efficient. He continued, stating Edison would like to discuss ways to standardize the process, find a better way to notify other members, and to insure specific information is available. Mr. Klarich gauged the interest of the members in starting a subcommittee dedicated to the standardization of third party notifications. Most of the members were interested in meeting to further discuss options for storage and notification of third party documents. Mr. Eastwood volunteered schedule a Webex meeting for all interested parties. Ms. Chirrick reported AT&T will be using NJUNS in the north region to try and standardize third party notifications. Mr. Wayne stated although Edison preferred software is Spida, the software would be able to communicate to other programs making the sharing of information possible. Mr. Wayne also stated the information in Spida would be available to companies not using Spida. After discussion the members agreed to add **Item 1586: Rule 18 Notification** to the Discussion agenda.

Review of Action Items:

- Ms. Haney to continue working on Tree trimming project
- Mr. Eastwood to schedule meeting to discuss Rule 18 Notifications
- Add NJUNS to Discussion Agenda

The Meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m. until May 20, 2014.

Ryan Jones SCJPC Staff

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

May 20th, 2014
(Revised 06/17/2014)

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:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Mr. James Eastwood | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Jeff Klarich | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Larry Chow | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Wayne Brown | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. James Sawatzki | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Jeff Williams | City of Los Angeles |
| Mr. David Siewert | City of Los Angeles |
| Ms. Manijeh Nava | AT&T California |
| Ms. Janet Chirrick | AT&T California |
| Ms. Lynn Prescott | Verizon Wireless |
| Ms. Lupe Hernandez | Teleport Communications America |
| Ms. Paula Haney | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Mr. Rory Gandy | AT&T Mobility |
| Ms. Yvonne Johnson | AT&T Mobility |
| Ms. Maria Ortiz | XO Communication |
| Mr. Albert Aleman | Verizon Ca, MCI / COMM / Metro |
| Mr. Larry Vail | Verizon Ca, MCI / COMM / Metro |
| Mr. William Kerns | Verizon Ca, MCI / COMM / Metro |
| Ms. Kourtney Wietecha | Extenet Systems |
| Mr. Paul Smolarski | T-mobile USA |
| Ms. Angela Pranata | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Kyle Levy | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Ryan Jones | SCJPC Staff |

Those attending via teleconference were:

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Ms. Alicia Smith | Sprint/Nextel Sprint Communications |
| Mr. Josh Mathisen | AT&T California |
| Mr. Jeff Williams | City of Los Angeles |
| Mr. Joe Serrato | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |

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 none at the time.

The second item on the agenda was **Compliance with Routine handbook**. Ms. Haney stated this was a standing agenda item and to be discussed at every Compliance meeting. Ms.

Haney inquired if members had any questions or concerns. There were none. The members agreed to table this item until the next Compliance meeting.

The third item on the agenda was **Item 1571: Tree trimming at Communication Level.** Ms. Haney reported she was still working on this and requested that this item be tabled for the next Compliance meeting.

The fourth item on the agenda was **Item 1586: Review of Rule 18 Notification.** Mr. Klarich reported interested members were able to meet on 5/08/2014 to discuss the standardization of the Rule 18 notification process. Mr. Klarich explained in the meeting members discussed what to send and what not to send in accordance with G.O. Rule 18-B. The members discussed what criteria would be needed for a pole deemed a significant threat. Mr. Klarich stated during the meeting members discussed the creation of a list of “you find it you fix it” referencing broken guy guards as an example. He continued, stating members were in agreement of establishing a list of minimum required information needed on a notification. Mr. Klarich reported Spida Min would provide a presentation at the next Administrative Board meeting. Mr. Klarich inquired to see if member thought a response to the notifications would be needed. Mr. Chow stated it was understood by members that no response would be needed as it is not required by the G.O. rules. Mr. Klarich suggested the committee members should memorialize verbiage explaining the reason a response would be needed or not. After discussion the members agreed to schedule another workshop meeting to further discuss Rule 18 notifications on 6/12/2014. The members agreed to work in the list of what a significant threat was and to table this item for the next compliance meeting.

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

Mr. Chow presented an issue with priority replacement pole being submitted under section 7.11. Mr. Chow stated the 45 days review would not apply because of the circumstances. Mr. Hernandez agreed stating the 45 day review was not applicable because the pole is a safety hazard. Ms. Hernandez stated priority pole JPAs must be notated to inform all parties involved that the pole was a safety hazard. Mr. Chow stated for a pole to be considered a priority, the pole needs to be overloaded and have physical damage before it is replaced. Mr. Chow informed members that a priority1 poles do not go through the design process, it goes straight to construction. Mr. Aleman argued stating members should agree on all fronts if a pole is truly a priority replacement. Mr. Aleman stated without the agreement he was of the opinion that section 7.13 is not applicable. He continued, stating with a priority 1 pole the replacement happens within 72 hours, giving Edison enough time to contact members notifying them of the replacement. Mr. Aleman stated in section 7.11 there is nothing in the verbiage dictating the replacing member notifies other owners of the replacement. Mr. Aleman stated if owners were notified of the replacement they would be able to notify Edison of any type of changes other members may have planned for the damaged pole. Mr. Aleman then stated he has received section 7.11 priority 1 JPAs where the supporting documents show that the pole was not replaced within the 72 hours allotted. Ms. Hernandez stated she too has received JPAs where the documentation doesn't correspond with a priority 1 replacement. Ms. Hernandez stated such JPAs would be denied. Mr. Aleman stated that the issue is with the lag time from when the problem was identified, when it was replaced, and when the notification was received. Ms.

Haney suggested a change in the process to include a call or some type of notification that a priority 1 pole is being replaced. Mr. Chow stated Edison created their process base on the verbiage written in the Routine Handbook on section 7.13. Mr. Chow noted priority 1 poles take an entirely different avenue for construction. Mr. Aleman argued, stating there is no verbiage in the Routine Handbook stating the 45 days was not applicable for section 7.11 on a priority 1 pole. Mr. Chow stated although not in the Routine Handbook priority 1 poles have used section 7.11 without the 45day notice for several years. Mr. Aleman inquired how pole loading calculations were accurately made by power utilities when no notifications were made to other owners. Mr. Williams stated “worst case scenario” would be used; ensuring the facilities on the pole would not overload the replacement pole. Ms. Prescott stated owners could deny paying for a pole in which worst case scenario was used. After discussion the members agreed to further discuss this topic under Item 1587: Review of Section 7.6, 7.11, 7.13 in the Routine Revision meeting.

Mr. Hernandez presented an issue of plant damaged or priority poles with a cell site. Ms. Hernandez stated poles built prior to 2008 would be grandfathered and replaced “like for like.” Ms. Hernandez stated a car crashed pole was replaced “like for like” but the CPUC is claiming the poles are not compliant after the replacement. After discussion the members agree to table this issue.

Review of Action Items:

- Ms. Haney to continue working on Tree trimming project
- Mr. Klarich to schedule meeting to discuss Rule 18 Notifications
- Add Item 1587: Review of section 7.6, 7.11, 7.13 to Routine Agenda

The Meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m. until June 17th, 2014.

Ryan Jones SCJPC Staff

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

June 17th, 2014

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. Jessica Pearson | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Jeff Klarich | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Larry Chow | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Wayne Brown | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Steve Brown | City of Los Angeles |
| Ms. Manijeh Nava | AT&T California |
| Ms. Janet Chirrick | AT&T California |
| Mr. Josh Mathisen | AT&T California |
| Ms. Lynn Prescott | Verizon Wireless |
| Ms. Lupe Hernandez | Teleport Communications America |
| Mr. Joe Serrato | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Paula Haney | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Mr. Rory Gandy | AT&T Mobility |
| Ms. Yvonne Johnson | AT&T Mobility |
| Ms. Maria Ortiz | XO Communication |
| Mr. Larry Vail | Verizon Ca, MCI / COMM / Metro |
| Mr. Paul Smolarski | T-mobile USA |
| Ms. Angela Pranata | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Kyle Levy | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Ryan Jones | SCJPC Staff |

Those attending via teleconference were:

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Ms. Alicia Smith | Sprint/Nextel Sprint Communications |
| Mr. Stephen Pebley | Frontier Communications |
| Ms. Marina Birarova | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Lily Tran | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |

Ms. Haney opened the meeting by referencing last month's minutes, inquiring if there were comments or any changes that needed to be made. Ms. Haney stated Ms. Wietecha's should be replaced with Ms. Haney's name.

The second item on the agenda was **Compliance with Routine handbook**. Ms. Haney stated this was a standing agenda item and to be discussed at every Compliance meeting. Ms. Haney inquired if members had any questions or concerns. There were none. The members agreed to table this item until the next Compliance meeting.

The third item on the agenda was **Item 1571: Tree trimming at Communication Level**. Ms. Haney reported she was still working on this and requested that this item be tabled for the next Compliance meeting.

The fourth item on the agenda was **Item 1586: Review of Rule 18 Notification**. Mr. Klarich reported members expanded upon the list created in 2010. Mr. Klarich stated he is updating the list and will send to all interested members. Mr. Klarich reminded members the minutes from the meeting held on 6/09/2014 were available for review. After discussion, the members agreed to for the next compliance meeting.

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

Mr. Chow stated Edison was looking into automating third party tenant applications. Mr. Chow noted Edison would be extending the same type of online application for foreign JPAs submitted to Edison. Mr. Chow stated currently Edison will accept foreign JPA via email but generally mails them back to the originator. Mr. Chow queried the members to see if emailing said information would be present any issues. Mr. Haney stated members are currently emailing one another and did not foresee any problems Edison's proposed method.

Review of Action Items:

- Ms. Haney to continue working on Tree trimming project
- Mr. Klarich to send out updated version of 2010 lists

The Meeting adjourned at 9:15 a.m. until July 15th, 2014.

Ryan Jones SCJPC Staff

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

July 15th, 2014

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. Jessica Pearson | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Jeff Klarich | Southern California Edison |
| Ms. April Debarge | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Wayne Brown | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Steve Brown | City of Los Angeles |
| Ms. Manijeh Nava | AT&T California |
| Ms. Janet Chirrick | AT&T California |
| Mr. Josh Mathisen | AT&T California |
| Ms. Lynn Prescott | Verizon Wireless |
| Ms. Lupe Hernandez | Teleport Communications America |
| Ms. Paula Haney | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Kourtney Wietecha | Extenet Systems |
| Ms. Yvonne Johnson | AT&T Mobility |
| Ms. Maria Ortiz | XO Communication |
| Mr. William Kearns | Verizon Ca, MCI / COMM / Metro |
| Mr. Paul Smolarski | T-mobile USA |
| Ms. Angela Pranata | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Kyle Levy | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Ryan Jones | SCJPC Staff |

Those attending via teleconference were:

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Ms. Alicia Smith | Sprint/Nextel Sprint Communications |
| Mr. Stephen Pebley | Frontier Communications |
| Ms. Marina Birarova | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Lily Tran | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |

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 none at the time.

The second item on the agenda was **Compliance with Routine handbook**. Ms. Haney stated this was a standing agenda item and to be discussed at every Compliance meeting. Ms. Haney inquired if members had any questions or concerns. Ms. Pearson presented an issue with submitting JPAs to other members they approve the JPA as written. After construction a Form 48 is sent notifying the owner's construction was completed. Ms. Pearson stated they would then receive a Form 7 denying the charges. Ms. Pearson noted a JPA should not be approved within the 45 day then denied after construction is completed. After discussion, the members

agreed to create a JPA alert reminding members that a JPA cannot be denied after the JPA is approved. The members also to create a JPA alert reminding members a valid reason must be stated for denial of a JPA. Ms. Pearson presented an issue of Form 7 being sent the JPC office before the JPA is received notifying the staff not to bill until all issues are resolved. Ms. Pearson stated the Form 7's are not specific to the issues for the JPA. Once the JPA is received at the JPC office it is returned immediately citing the Form 7 on record. Ms. Pearson stated Form 7's should not be sent in the preliminary stage of the JPA process. She continued, stating members should only send in Form 7's if they are disputing a JPA that has already been submitted. After discussion, the members agreed to create a JPA alert reminding members to verify Form 7's go to all owners of record. The member agreed if a Form 7 is sent preventing billing; it is the responsibility of the Form 7 initiator to verify if the dispute was resolved. The members agreed to table this item until the next Compliance meeting.

The third item on the agenda was **Item 1571: Tree trimming at Communication Level.** Ms. Haney stated after discussing the matter with other members sections 14.7 and 1.2 would be used to bill members for tree trimming costs. Ms. Haney stated the company creating the JPA would be responsible for obtaining permits and would divide the costs per pole billing each owner equally. After discussion, the members agreed to create an example JPA for the members to review.

The fourth item on the agenda was **Item 1586: Review of Rule 18 Notification.** Mr. Klarich reopened discussion of Review of Rule 18 notification by inquiring where members stood on the Safety Hazard Notification list as a guideline. Mr. Klarich continued, stating if members agreed the list (see attached) could be added to the Discussion for further discussion. Ms. Hernandez inquired if members were interested in using NJUNS as notification tool for safety hazards. After discussion the members agreed to see how NJUNS worked for the NJPC before making a decision on purchasing the software. Mr. Klarich presented a list of action items and responses from Edison's standpoint (see attached). The members agreed that if the Safety Hazard Notification list was approved the information stored in the reference section of the JPC website. The members agreed to query all members in the Administrative Board meeting to see who is interested in using NJUNS. After discussion, the members agreed to table this item for the next compliance meeting.

The last item on the agenda was **Miscellaneous** issues. There were none.

Review of Action Items:

- Create JPA alert regarding Form 7 protocol for stopping billing & copies sent to all owners of record
- Ms. Haney to Send Form 2 example
- Query members on interests in NJUNS at Administrative Board meeting
- Add Safety hazard Notification list to Discussion Calendar

The Meeting adjourned at 10:20 a.m. until August 19th, 2014.

Ryan Jones SCJPC Staff

SCJPC Rule 18 Notification Workshop

Thu, June 12, 2014

9:00 AM - 1:00 PM

Based on SCE internal meetings and our participation in the SCJPC workshops, the following are SCE's responses to the action items coming out of the SCJPC Rule 18 Notification sub-committee meetings.

Action Items

- 1) Review 2010 agreements (attached, Sam Stonerock: facilitator)
This item was performed by participating parties before the June 12th workshop, no further action required.
- 2) Develop a list of what GO 95 infractions to send and not to send
The SCJPC - SAFETY HAZARD NOTIFICATION LIST was reviewed and updated. A copy of the revised list will be distributed to the SCJPC for review and approval.
After discussion it was decided not to pursue a "Do Not Send List". A major consideration in this decision was that by establishing a list, future compliance could also be determined by adherence to this set of guidelines, in addition to the General Order. It was felt that for those non-safety related reoccurring infractions which companies feel would be better addressed outside the Rule 18 process, that direct communication and agreement between companies would be best.
- 3) List of Find & Fix items (discussion between parties at the May 8th workshop found that most participating members felt that there were some items that it was simpler to fix on the spot, i.e., guy guards, than go through the notification process. Understandably, some company's inspection programs would be impacted, but the idea merited enough interest to be discussed more.)
SCE does not see a benefit in participating in such a program at this time and will not be promoting any further discussions. If other SCJPC members want to pursue and support this effort, SCE leaves it up to them to take the lead and continue the effort.
- 4) Don't need to respond to receipt of Rule 18 notifications. R18 does not mention needing to respond to the company sending the notification, either:
 - a) That a company received a GO 95 Rule 18 notification
 - b) That an infraction was fixedDiscussion at the May 20, 2014 Ad hoc meetings indicated that memorializing this understanding would be best.
A document to memorialize this will be generated for the July Ad hoc meeting.
It will not include CIP guy failures found from a pole load calculation. CIP guy failure notifications will not be completed until the CIP provides feedback that their failed guy has been remediated.
- 5) List of the minimum information/data needed to be included in a notification
SCE will provide its list to the other SCJPC members for review. If there is interest to pursue this item it should be brought up at the July ad hoc meeting.

6) Incorporation of Pictures

- a) At least (1) one
- b) Recommend a minimum number of (4) four

During the June 12th workshop it was agreed by the participating parties that the inclusion of pictures would be beneficial. When possible, including the following 3 pictures would provide the most benefit: 1) picture showing the infraction itself, 2) picture of the entire pole, 3) picture showing pole number. A fourth or more picture(s) providing additional information regarding the infraction would be left to the discretion of the inspector.

Each company will make an effort to include pictures.

7) Notifications outside of R18 that would be helpful to receive

SCE does not see a benefit in participating in such a program at this time and will not be promoting any further discussions. If other SCJPC members want to pursue and support this effort, SCE leaves it up to them to take the lead and continue the effort.

SCE does consider 3rd party pedestals located such that they interfere or obstruct the opening of our pad mounted switches/relays a safety hazard to our technicians and currently SCE sends third party notifications to pedestals owners.

8) Follow up on vegetation notifications

- a) Is there a need and how to implement
- b) Trim vegetation as needed to climb/access the pole

SCE does not completely understand the nature of the issue and will not be promoting any further discussions. If other SCJPC members want to pursue and support this effort, SCE leaves it up to them to take the lead and continue the effort.

SCJPC - SAFETY HAZARD NOTIFICATION LIST

As prescribed by the Public Utilities Commission of the State Of California
GENERAL ORDER No. 95

Rules for Overhead Electric Line Construction

Rule 18: Reporting and Resolution of Safety Hazards Discovered by Utilities

For purposes of this rule, "Safety Hazard" means a condition that poses a significant threat to human life or property.

Rule 18B: Notification of Safety Hazards

If a company, while performing inspections of its facilities, discovers a safety hazard(s) on or near a communications facility or electric facility involving another company, the inspecting company shall notify the other company and/or facility owner of such safety hazard(s) ...

For the purpose of this list the Joint Pole Committee further clarifies "safety hazard" as an existing condition in danger of failing that poses a significant threat to human life or property.

Poles (Joint Use)

- Broken/Damaged
- Deformed
- Excessive lean (Rule of thumb: 1ft per 10ft)
- Shallow (washed out, set shallow, landscaping changes)

Anchors Rods

- Broken/Damaged
- Shallow
- Overpopulated (More guys than anchor head designed for and supplemental guy eyes - piggybacking)

Ground Wires (Electric or Communication)

- Broken (separated ground wires at any level)
- Exposed (ground molding missing - ground-line to – 10ft)
- Unauthorized attachment (Communication bonded to Electric ground)

Cable Risers (Electric – all Classes)

- Broken/Damaged w/exposed cable

Vegetation

- Insufficient clearance to high voltage lines
- Contact w/ low voltage lines and deflection impacting pole
- Contact w/ communication cables and deflection (12 inches or more) impacting pole

Attachments

- Crossarms
 - Broken/Damaged

- Guys
 - Span
 - Broken/Damaged
 - Contact with other facilities
 - Anchor (Down)
 - Broken/Damaged (detached)
 - Slack
 - Contact with other facilities

- Cables (Communication or Electric)
 - Detached (from pole, crossarm insulator, messenger)
 - Insufficient vertical clearances (above ground level, below electric lines- all classes)
 - Excessive Dancing/Galloping (observed on windy days)
 - Broken / Damaged lashing wire (where support messenger and cable are within 6 ft. of high voltage lines)

- Conductors (Electric – All Classes)
 - Detached (from pole, crossarm insulator or messenger)
 - Insufficient vertical clearances (ground level, communication lines, buildings/structures)
 - Excessive Dancing / Galloping (observed on windy days)
 - Conductive debris (e.g. Mylar balloons)

- Gross mechanical defects (Electric or Communication)
 - Equipment leaking or loose

Handholes (Electric)

- Broken/Damaged
- Lid not secure

(Revised June 12, 2014)

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

August 19th, 2014

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. Jessica Pearson | Southern California Edison |
| Ms. April Debarge | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Larry Chow | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Wayne Brown | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Scott Hunter | City of Los Angeles |
| Mr. Steve Brown | City of Los Angeles |
| Ms. Manijeh Nava | AT&T California |
| Ms. Lupe Hernandez | Teleport Communications America |
| Ms. Paula Haney | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Yvonne Johnson | AT&T Mobility |
| Ms. Maria Ortiz | XO Communication |
| Mr. William Kearns | Verizon Ca, MCI / COMM / Metro |
| Mr. Paul Smolarski | T-mobile USA |
| Ms. Angela Pranata | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Kyle Levy | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Ryan Jones | SCJPC Staff |

Those attending via teleconference were:

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Ms. Janet Chirrick | AT&T California |
| Mr. Joe Serrato | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Mr. Earle Carrion | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Mr. Gunay Salahi | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Jane Bibb | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |

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 none at the time.

The second item on the agenda was **Compliance with Routine handbook**. Ms. Haney stated this was a standing agenda item and to be discussed at every Compliance meeting. Ms. Haney inquired if members had any questions or concerns. There were none. The members agreed to table this item until the next Compliance meeting.

The third item on the agenda was **Item 1571: Tree trimming at Communication Level**. Ms. Haney reported she was able to create an example JPA show how the tree trimming project would look on a JPA (see attached). Ms. Haney stated the member in charge of the project

would incur all costs prior to the reimbursement from the JPA. Ms. Haney stated members owning space in the communication area they would be billed. Mr. Chow inquired if the addition of an authorized cost would better suit the member's needs. Ms. Haney stated this was a specific approach to the issue because traffic control, permitting and tree trimming were all associated with this project. Mr. Chow inquired besides the pole record what other measures would be taken to ensure all owners of record are billed. Ms. Haney stated the field notes from the G.O. 95 inspector would be available for comparison of ownership. She continued, stating the initiating member would need to verify the discrepancies before charging tree trimming costs. The members discussed how it would be decided which member would take the lead on future tree trimming projects. Mr. Chow inquired if the third party notification regarding tree trimming indicated which communication attachments were being pushed out of lead. If stated on the third party notification would the onus be put on all owners at the communication level or the infracted owners. Ms. Haney noted the third party notifications received did not specify a specific owner. Mr. Chow made a point that the authorized costs already established for tree trimming does not allow for the initiating member to recoup actual costs instead refunding the initiating member an average cost for the work. Ms. Hernandez stated this tree trimming was outside of the normal joint pole costs. After discussion the members agreed to forward the example JPA to all members involved in the tree trimming project. The members also agreed that tree trimming projects will be treated case by case. The members agreed to table this item for the next Compliance meeting.

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

The members agreed to close review of Rule 18 Notification Workshop Action Items

Review of Action Items:

- Ms. Haney to forward JPA example to all members involved in the tree trimming project

The Meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m. until September 16th, 2014.

Ryan Jones SCJPC Staff

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

September 16th, 2014

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:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Mr. Larry Chow | Southern California Edison |
| Ms. Valerie Mitwasi | Southern California Edison |
| Ms. April Debarge | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Richard Labarge | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Wayne Brown | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Scott Hunter | City of Los Angeles |
| Ms. Manijeh Nava | AT&T California |
| Ms. Paula Haney | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Yvonne Johnson | AT&T Mobility |
| Ms. Maria Ortiz | XO Communication |
| Mr. Ali Nour | City of Vernon |
| Ms. Maryam Farajzadeh | City of Vernon |
| Ms. Kourtney Wietcha | Extenet Systems |
| Ms. Angela Pranata | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Kyle Levy | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Ryan Jones | SCJPC Staff |

Those attending via teleconference were:

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Ms. Alicia Smith | Sprint/Nextel Sprint Communications |
| Mr. Joe Serrato | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Mr. Earle Carrion | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Mr. Gunay Salahi | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Jane Bibb | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Marina Birarova | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Lupe Hernandez | Teleport Communications America |
| Ms. Lynn Prescott | Verizon Wireless |
| Ms. Tracey Province | Verizon Ca, MCI / COMM / Metro |

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 none at the time.

The second item on the agenda was **Compliance with Routine handbook**. Ms. Haney stated this was a standing agenda item and to be discussed at every Compliance meeting. Ms. Haney inquired if members had any questions or concerns. There were none. The members agreed to table this item until the next Compliance meeting.

The third item on the agenda was **Item 1571: Tree trimming at Communication Level**. Ms. Haney presented a revised example of the tree trimming scenarios (see attached). Ms. Haney explained one example used item 13b/c costs and one using actual costs. Ms. Haney suggested both of the examples be added to the Routine Handbook. Mr. Chow inquired what scenario dictates what version of tree trim billing to use. Ms. Haney stated in situations outside of normal vegetation removal or tree trimming where additional cost will be incurred is when actual costs should be used. The after discussion, the members agreed to move the examples to the Routine Revisions meetings for further discussion.

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

Mr. Chow presented an issue of Edison sending Form 2s to Verizon indicating pole replacements. Verizon sends back a Form 7 stating not to bill the JPA, sending a carbon copy to the committee staff. Mr. Chow stated a dialogue should take place between the members before a Form 7 is sent. After discussion, the members agreed a Form 7 can only be sent to the committee staff if the members could not reach an agreement. Mr. Wayne Brown presented an issue where work was completed in the field but needed minor changes to what was agreed on. Mr. Wayne Brown stated a Form 7 would be sent with the Form 48 but Verizon is denying the charges. The members agreed a Form 7 can be sent with a Form 48 for minor changes.

Mr. Wayne Brown presented an issue of JPAs being denied with poles Edison was supposed to PTD but could only top the pole. He continued stating a Form 7 was sent notifying members that the PTD would not occur. Mr. Wayne Brown stated the members denying the charges are citing section 10.8 stating approval is needed. Ms. Province stated JPAs were being denied because the transfer was unacceptable. Mr. Wayne Brown argued Edison should be compensated for the poles which transfers were acceptable. Ms. Hernandez suggested this scenario should continue to be handled case by case. She continued stating members cannot blatantly say no to a transfer, the transfer should be field checked and if not up to specifications citing the reason for denial of the transfer. Mr. Chow stated in past discussions the members agreed as long as the power company hard landed facilities onto the new pole the power company would be paid. Mr. Chow noted communication companies want their facilities transferred to their specifications. Ms. Haney stated there were instances where Edison performed a transfer and Crown Castle had to send a crew to redo the work because it was poorly transferred. Ms. Nava suggested the use of a third party contractor for transfers. She explained the contractor would be familiar with communications specifications making all transfers agreeable by all parties involved. After discussion, the members agreed to table this subject for the next Compliance meeting.

Mr. Hunter presented an issue if receiving corrected preliminary JPAs after the 45 day timeframe. The members agreed corrections should be made within the 45 day and not after.

Mr. Chow inquired if a tenant needed to be moved or changed would it need to be captured on a JPA. Ms. Haney was of the opinion if members were doing work within their own space a JPA was not necessary. Ms. Wietecha stated if no paperwork was submitted the records would not match what was in the field.

Ms. Haney inquired what members should do with less than priority Rule 18 pole. Ms. Haney stated it was important to notify members of the minor infractions. Mr. Elston stated Crown Castle has explored several options for communication. One of which is to use NJUNs database, another was to use a secondary notification, and lastly was to create a letter of understanding between the owners. Mr. Elston inquired if members were willing to take any of these avenues for notification purposes. Ms. Hernandez stated a Form 11 was created to notify members of a low priority Rule 18 notification. Ms. Haney stated this was an issue of not having a point of contact for such issues. Ms. Province argued once the infraction was identified and the correct priority level was associated the infracting member(s) would be notified and the onus would fall on them to rectify the situation. After discussion the members agreed to discuss this subject internally within each of the companies and to discuss further at the next Compliance meeting.

Mr. Hunter stated section 3.4 dictates that owners notify other members when constructing risers. He inquired who was responsible for notifying members if it was a tenant placing the riser. The members agreed the member that has the lease agreement with the tenant is responsible for notifying members the tenant placed a riser. The members agreed to clarify the verbiage in section 3.4 to clarify tenant riser scenarios.

Mr. Wayne Brown inquired if there was a way to hold other owners responsible to make sure work is complete in regards to buddy poles. He continued stating the buddy poles are preventing Edison from receiving the proper permits to work in some areas because other members have not taken care of their buddy poles. Mr. Wayne Brown reminded members at the last Compliance meeting he suggested the use of actual costs to recoup funds for Edison having to go back to the field to remove another member's buddy pole. He continued stating he would send individualized list to the members identifying the buddy poles that need to be pulled. Mr. Wayne Brown stated if a customer complaint is encountered a response to that specific pole would be needed so Edison could relay that information to the customer. Mr. Wayne Brown stated Edison is not receiving a Form 48 when the work is completed. After discussion, the members agreed to create a JPA alert reminding members once a member has completed their work regarding a foreign JPA a Form 48 should be sent to the initiating member notifying them that work has been completed.

Review of Action Items:

- Mr. Levy to create JPA alert reminding members once a member has completed their work regarding a foreign JPA a Form 48 should be sent to the initiating member notifying them that work has been completed.

The Meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m. until October 14th, 2014.

Ryan Jones SCJPC Staff

PRELIMINARY JOINT POLE AUTHORIZATION

POLE ACCESS OBSTRUCTIONS

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>(1) When it's necessary to clear obstructions (vegetation or hardscape) from a work area Section 19.4 and Item 13b or 13c enable the owner having the work performed to recover shared costs from the other pole owners.</p> <p>(2) Illustration of vegetation clearance in conjunction with other pole work.</p> | <p>(3) Only owners with impacted facilities and/or tenant facilities will share in the authorized costs.</p> <p>(4) Include a note under remarks to specify which owners are to reimburse when less than all owners are impacted.</p> |
|--|---|

PRELIMINARY JOINT POLE AUTHORIZATION

TREE TRIMMING

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>(1) When it's necessary to clear vegetation from a work area under Section 14.7 Items 13b or 13c will be applied. Item 13b has a set cost. For costs exceeding 13b, Item 13c enables the owner having the work performed to recover shared costs from the other pole owners.</p> <p>(2) Illustration of vegetation clearance in conjunction with other pole work.</p> <p>(3) Only owners with impacted facilities and/or tenant facilities will share in the authorized costs.</p> | <p>(4) Include a note under remarks to specify which owners are to reimburse when less than all owners are impacted.</p> <p>(5) Note why Item 19c is being used.</p> <p>(6) A written estimate is required or A written estimate must be made available to impacted owners upon request.</p> |
|---|--|

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT POLE TRANSACTION

J.P. FORM 2-1 Preliminary 1/95

Date Prepared 1/2/2014

This authorization is in accordance with Joint Pole Agreement and Routine. The undersigned have agreed on joint work as specified hereon.

Date Sent 1/3/2014

Confirming Agreement _____

In Field

By Telephone

Est. Const. Start _____

No. of Pages 1

J.P. Auth.No. U1-5678

| UTILITY | REPRESENTATIVE | DISTRICT-DIVISION-EXCHANGE | APPROVED | TAXING INSTRUCTIONS | ACCOUNTING DATA |
|---------|----------------|----------------------------|----------|---------------------|-----------------|
| U1 | M EVANS | LOS ANGELES | D SCOTT | LOS ANGELES | XXX-XXX |
| U2 | J SERRATO | LOS ANGELES | | LOS ANGELES | |
| U3 | E CARRION | LOS ANGELES | | LOS ANGELES | |
| U4 | J COLLINS | LOS ANGELES | | LOS ANGELES | |
| | | | | | |

| POLE NO. | Pole Length Anchor Size | Year Set | Pole Trt Class Anchor Direct. | Record | | | | Proposed | | | | Item No. | LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK If not in accordance with Joint Pole agreement and routine-state reasons. | |
|----------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|------|------|----------|----------|------|------|----------|----------|--|-----------|
| | | | | U1 | U2 | U3 | U4 | U1 | U2 | U3 | U4 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | 16KV | | | | 16KV | | | | | REPLACE POLE SEC 7.11 CLEAR POLE ACCESS OBSTRUCTION SEC 19.4 | 1 |
| 12345-U1 | 50 | 48 | FT | 43-12 | 23-1 | 24-1 | 22-4 T22 | | | | PTD | | TOPANGA CYN RD W/S 545' N/O IMPERIAL | 2 |
| | | | | 25-1 C25 | | | | | | | | | | 3 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 6 |
| 22443-U1 | 55 | 14 | FT | | | | | 48-17 | 23-1 | 24-1 | 22-4 T22 | | TOPANGA CYN RD W/S 544' N/O IMPERIAL | 7 |
| | | | | | | | | 25-1 C25 | | | | | | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | 1/4(1) | | | | 13b | TRIM TREE BRANCHES AWAY FROM POLE | 9 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 10 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 11 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 12 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13 |

POLE LEGEND: L = LOWER TOP (Item 5E)
 P = PULL (Item 5A) C(XX) = FOOTAGE CUT
 PB = PULL BUTT SCZ = SAFETY CLEARANCE ZONE
 T = TRANSPORT (Item 5B)
 S = SALVAGE
 D = DISPOSE (Item 5D)
 TN = TENANT

ANCHOR/ARM LEGEND:
 AR = ANCHOR/ARM REMOVED
 AT = ANCHOR/ARM TRANSFERRED

Show Quantity of Items to be billed in the Column of Party to be Paid.

↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑
GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION

LOS ANGELES
 COMMUNITY

VP/J.P.-03

Rev. Jul 2013

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT POLE TRANSACTION

J.P. FORM 2-1 Preliminary 1/95

Date Prepared 1/2/2014

This authorization is in accordance with Joint Pole Agreement and Routine. The undersigned have agreed on joint work as specified hereon.

Date Sent 1/3/2014

Confirming Agreement _____

In Field

By Telephone

Est. Const. Start _____

No. of Pages 1

J.P. Auth.No. U2-5678

| UTILITY | REPRESENTATIVE | DISTRICT-DIVISION-EXCHANGE | APPROVED | TAXING INSTRUCTIONS | ACCOUNTING DATA |
|---------|----------------|----------------------------|----------|---------------------|-----------------|
| U1 | M EVANS | LOS ANGELES | | LOS ANGELES | |
| U2 | J SERRATO | LOS ANGELES | L TRAN | LOS ANGELES | XX-56-78 |
| U3 | E CARRION | LOS ANGELES | | LOS ANGELES | |
| U4 | J COLLINS | LOS ANGELES | | LOS ANGELES | |

| POLE NO. | Pole Length Anchor Size | Year Set | Pole Trt Class Anchor Direct. | Record | | | | Proposed | | | | Item No. | LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK If not in accordance with Joint Pole agreement and routine-state reasons. | |
|----------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|---------------|------|------|-------------|----------|--------|----|----|----------|--|-----------|
| | | | | U1 | U2 | U3 | U4 | U1 | U2 | U3 | U4 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | 16KV | | | | | | |
| 9876-U1 | 60 | 48 | FT | 52-13 32-2 | 30-1 | 33-1 | 29-4 T29 | | | | | | TOPANGA CYN RD W/S 545' N/O IMPERIAL (630 C2) | 2 |
| | | | | 25-7 C31 | | | | | | | | | | 3 |
| | | | | | | | | | 1/4(1) | | | 13c | \$300 | 4 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | TREE TRIMMING SEC 1.2 & 14.7, MISC SHARED COSTS SEC 14.0 | 6 |
| 5678-U1 | 55 | 49 | FT | 48-14 | 27-1 | 28-1 | 26-8 T26 | | | | | | TOPANGA CYN BL E/S 130' N/O FERNWOOD DR | 7 |
| | | | | | | | | | 1/3(1) | | | 13c | \$300 - U3 & U4 REIMBURSE U2 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | 1/4(1) | | | 15a | RETAG POLE | 9 |
| | | | | | | | | | 1/3(1) | | | 110e | PLACE GUY GUARD - U1 & U3 REIMBURSE U2 | 10 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 11 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL PER POLE COST EXCEEDS AUTHORIZED COST OF ITEM 19b | 12 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL \$600 FOR 2 POLES - TREE TRIM, CALTRANS PERMIT AND TRAFFIC CONTROL = \$300 PER POLE | 13 |

POLE LEGEND: L = LOWER TOP (Item 5E)
 P = PULL (Item 5A) C(XX) = FOOTAGE CUT
 PB = PULL BUTT SCZ = SAFETY CLEARANCE ZONE
 T = TRANSPORT (Item 5B)
 S = SALVAGE
 D = DISPOSE (Item 5D)
 TN = TENANT

ANCHOR/ARM LEGEND:
 AR = ANCHOR/ARM REMOVED
 AT = ANCHOR/ARM TRANSFERRED

Show Quantity of Items to be billed in the Column of Party to be Paid.

↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑
GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION

LOS ANGELES
 COMMUNITY

VP/J.P.-03

Rev. Jul 2013

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

October 14th, 2014

A meeting of the Compliance Committee took place on the above date, at 9:45 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Ms. Lupe Hernandez | Teleport Communications America |
| Ms. April Debarge | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Wayne Brown | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Larry Chow | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Scott Hunter | City of Los Angeles |
| Ms. Paula Haney | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Yvonne Johnson | AT&T Mobility |
| Ms. Maria Ortiz | XO Communication |
| Mr. Larry Vail | Verizon Ca, MCI / COMM / Metro |
| Mr. Albert Aleman | Verizon Ca, MCI / COMM / Metro |
| Ms. Kourtney Wietecha | Extenet Systems |
| Ms. Manijeh Nava | AT&T California |
| Ms. Angela Pranata | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Kyle Levy | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Ryan Jones | SCJPC Staff |

Those attending via teleconference were:

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Ms. Tracey Province | Verizon Ca, MCI / COMM / Metro |
| Ms. Janet Chirrick | AT&T California |
| Mr. Stephen Pebley | Frontier Communications |
| Mr. Earle Carrion | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Mr. Joe Serrato | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Jane Bibb | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Marina Birarova | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Lilly Tran | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Alicia Smith | Sprint/Nextel Sprint Communications |

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 none at the time.

The second item on the agenda was **Compliance with Routine handbook**. Ms. Haney stated this was a standing agenda item and to be discussed at every Compliance meeting. Ms.

Haney inquired if members had any questions or concerns. There were none. The members agreed to table this item until the next Compliance meeting.

The third item on the agenda was **Item 1571: Tree trimming at Communication Level.** Ms. Haney stated she was unable to provide an example of G.O. 95 tree trimming. Ms. Haney requested this item be tabled for the next Compliance meeting.

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

Mr. Wayne Brown stated Edison will begin setting sectional composite poles. He continued, stating Edison has tested different manufacturers and one of the specific items Edison is interested in are pole bands. Mr. Wayne Brown explained pole bands will become a requirement for composite sectional poles and each manufacturer has a specific pole band requirement. Mr. Wayne Brown stated Edison currently has some of the sectional composite poles at their Chino yard and suggested a field visit. After discussion, the members agreed to try and schedule a field me to view the sectional composite poles.

Review of Action Items:

- Mr. Wayne Brown to setup field meet
- Ms. Haney to complete G.O. 95 tree trimming example

The Meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m. until November 18th, 2014.

Ryan Jones SCJPC Staff

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

November 18, 2014

A meeting of the **ad hoc Compliance Committee** took place on the above date, at 10:20 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

| | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| Ms. April Debarge | Southern California Edison |
| Ms. Jessica Pearson | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Wayne Brown | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Larry Chow | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Richard LaBarge | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Scott Hunter | City of Los Angeles |
| Mr. Steve Brown | City of Los Angeles |
| Ms. Lynn Prescott | Verizon Wireless |
| Ms. Yvonne Johnson | AT&T Mobility |
| Ms. Maria Ortiz | XO Communication |
| Mr. Albert Aleman | Verizon Ca, MCI / COMM / Metro |
| Ms. Angela Pranata | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Kyle Levy | SCJPC Staff |
| Mr. Ryan Jones | SCJPC Staff |

Those attending via teleconference were:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Ms. Tracey Province | Verizon Ca, MCI / COMM / Metro |
| Ms. Janet Chirrick | AT&T California |
| Ms. Kourtney Wietecha | Extenet Systems |
| Ms. Lupe Hernandez | Teleport Communications America |
| Ms. Paula Haney | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Mr. Earle Carrion | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Mr. Joe Serrato | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Jane Bibb | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Marina Birarova | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Lilly Tran | Crown Castle NG West Inc. /NewPath Networks/CA-CLEC LLC |
| Ms. Alicia Smith | Sprint/Nextel Sprint Communications |

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 none at the time.

The second item on the agenda was **Compliance with Routine handbook**. Ms. Haney stated this was a standing agenda item and to be discussed at every Compliance meeting. Ms.

Haney inquired if members had any questions or concerns. There were none. The members agreed to table this item until the next Compliance meeting.

The third item on the agenda was **Item 1571: Tree trimming at Communication Level.** Ms. Haney reported she has received responses to the examples she created from Ms. Hernandez and Ms. Smith but was unable to review them. Ms. Haney requested this item be tabled for the next Compliance meeting.

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

Mr. Chow inquired what the rules were related to following (or not following) the pole replacement guidelines. He continued, stating the committee members never discussed what the guidelines would be used for, or if the guideline were formally accepted. Ms. Chirrick reminded members the guidelines derived from the PG&E diagram. Ms. Haney stated that this was already in use as a reference item. Mr. Chow noted that there had not been an official agreement stating Verizon and AT&T agree to the guidelines. Both Verizon and AT&T were in favor of making the guidelines official. After discussion, the members agreed to review the pole replacement guidelines to see if the current guidelines are acceptable. The members agreed to table this issue for the next Compliance meeting.

Ms. Chirrick presented an issue with SCE's approved maintenance plan. She encountered 7 poles in October that were put in HSO that should have been HLA. Ms. Chirrick inquired if there was a checking system to verify poles were recorded with the correct territory. Mr. Chow stated the reason a HSO pole would show HLA was because that is how the pole was originally recorded. Ms. Hernandez suggested AT&T review the Multiple Pole Search list against the city to find discrepancies in recorded locations.

Ms. Haney inquired if Edison was willing to accept a spreadsheet for a transfer of ownership JPA between Sprint and NG where Edison was the only other owner of record. Mr. Chow stated the spreadsheet was acceptable for submission. Ms. Haney stated she was able to find 66 poles that fell under this category and notified Mr. Chow of her intent to submit the spreadsheet. Mr. Chow reminded Ms. Haney that although the spreadsheet is acceptable there still needed to be a JPA created with the spreadsheet attached.

Ms. Haney brought up for discussion the scenario of Crown Castle taking ownership of some AT&T Mobility antennas. Per agreement, the remote, if located on the pole, would remain with AT&T Mobility. Mr. Carrion explained the remote is the equipment located inside shroud box that amplifies the signal preparing it for transmission. Mr. Carrion stated in this specific situation the remote remains under the ownership of a utility that is no longer attached to the pole. He inquired if that utility still needs to be an owner on record even though the remote is attached to the common area. Mr. Chow and Mr. Hunter stated if a committee member owns equipment in the common space they would need to have ownership in the pole to access the common space. After discussion, the members agreed to discuss further offline to try and come to an agreement.

Mr. Wayne Brown reported Edison is trying to use cable tags as another avenue to indicate what is on the poles. Mr. Brown requested members verify tags to make sure the information on the tags are up to date and valid. After discussion, the members agreed to review current tags in use to make sure all information is correct.

Review of Action Items:

- AT&T to look into getting pole card accuracy
- Mr. Chow ok with NextG submitting SPR to NG ownership transfer spreadsheet
- Ms. Haney and Ms. Hernandez to take Remote Clarification discussion offline
- Ms. Haney to continue working with Ms. Smith and Ms. Hernandez on Tree Trimming example.
- Ms. Pranata to send follow up email requesting up to date Cable tags

The Meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m. until January 20th, 2015.

Ryan Jones SCJPC Staff