

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

September 15, 2009

A *special meeting* to address the **Los Angeles County Permits Requirements** took place on the above date, at 2:30 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Dennis Walls - City of LA -DWP
Ms. Shawn Henderson - AT&T Mobility
Ms. Lynn Prescott - Verizon Wireless
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Rich LeBarge – Southern California Edison
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California
Mr. Steve Rodriguez – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

The objective for the Los Angeles County Public Works special meeting is to address the county's grievance in regards to dual poles in the field.

Mr. Wolfe opened the meeting by reporting that LA County has an issue with their current encroachment procedure relative to the utilities and their pole replacement programs. Therefore, they have contacted that member utility they interact with the greatest, and that is SCE. The county informed SCE that they would no longer issue permits to SCE unless they are guaranteed that the old pole is removed within the permitted time factor. SCE then invited LA County to meet with fellow members at the last Board meeting to allow the County to express their concerns and gain a better understanding of the joint pole authorization process. The County would like to have the SCJPC present to them a process to circumvent the issue of dual poles in the field. Therefore, the committee members must work together and collaborate on a resolution to this issue. Mr. Wolfe added that his organization would fully support a process that would satisfy the County.

Mr. Wolfe proposed and stated that the most reasonable party to be responsible to pull the old pole is the lowest member on the pole, which is normally communications.

He added that from the date of the Form 48, all transfers must be completed within sixty days.

He further added in regards to requiring each member to acquire a permit, one member should acquire the permit notifying the County of the second party responsible for pulling the pole, and that party responsible for

PTD should also acquire a permit. This would result in two required permits, not multiple permits for the same pole.

Mr. Chow stated that the County originally was under the assumption that the poles were SCE poles only. They were not aware of the joint ownership relationship, and that there are some poles with multiple owners, and owners have different responsibilities for doing specific work.

He added arriving at an agreement that as a default, the lowest member on the pole is responsible for the PTD would create a process resulting in a resolution to this concern.

Mr. Autrey inquired if this proposed process would appease the County?

Mr. LeBarge responded that at an SCE meeting with the County, in which AT&T California was also present, the County is steadfast in identifying the member party under the scope of deteriorated pole replacement work that would be responsible for pulling that pole.

Mr. Chow inquired if the members are in agreement that the process discussed is the process to be presented to LA County at the next Board meeting with the County. In the process, SCE would be applying for permits and identify all members on the pole, and notate that party responsible for the PTD of the deteriorated pole. Thus, the County should expect that party responsible for PTD to apply for their permit shortly thereafter.

Mr. LeBarge reported that LA County has given SCE pictures of deteriorated poles that are a priority. He added that the poles have been addressed.

Ms. Prescott stated that the wireless members attempt to contact one another and agree to engage one approved contractor to transfer all facilities resulting in a single trip to the pole.

The members discussed the issue of wireless members attempting to coordinate work together to complete a job. Also discussed were different scenarios for PTD when there are wireless members on the pole.

Mr. Chow inquired if SCE could move forward and inform LA County that the SCJPC has identified a process for removing deteriorated poles from the field? He added that SCE would modify their permit process by notating all joint members on the pole and identify the PTD party.

The members agreed that the lowest member on the pole would be responsible to PTD. The members then reviewed and discussed the synopsis compiled by Ms. Hernandez (see attached). Mr. Chow stated that each individual member should have a process on how they would handle their portion of the primary PTD process. The County could be made aware that all members are addressing and responding to the deteriorated pole process within their respective organizations.

It was agreed that the members would inform other members at the Board meeting the following day, that it is the responsibility of the lowest member on a pole to handle the PTD.

Mr. Chow proposed creating a Power Point slide show to be presented to the County to demonstrate the PTD process and how poles appear when in a specific point in the process. This could aid the County in better understanding the deteriorated pole process.

The members are prepared to present the SCJPC deteriorated pole process to the County in October.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

ATTACHMENT

LA County Public Works:

- Wants to hold SCE responsible for coordinating the replacement process among members
SCE does not feel it is their responsibility
- Is proposing not to issue pole permits to SCE until all other joint members on the pole have obtained their permits to remove facilities.
- Wants to know the contact names and numbers of the utilities are on the pole in advance of issuing permits.
- Wants all owners on the list to request individual permits to do the work at the same time.
- Wants someone to bear the costs of the inspections. The County must recoup the inspection expense from the utilities.
- “Per County, either SCJPC is to create a process to ensure that all work is completed without the need of the County’s intervention or the County would no longer issue permits to SCE unless all members apply for a permit. Pressure is now on the members to comply”.

County will attend the October Admin Board meeting to determine if SCE’s improved process is successful.