

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 599-3801

June 15, 2022

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, **at 11:01 a.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:**

Ms. Maria Ortiz	XO Communication
Ms. April DeBarge	Southern California Edison
Ms. Valerie Mitwasi	Southern California Edison
Ms. Stacy Varner	Southern California Edison
Ms. Alicia Walsh	Southern California Edison
Ms. Camile Bowie	Southern California Edison
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Mr. Jeremy Harmon	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Earle Carrion	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Marc Buan	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Katy White	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications
Mr. Charlie Smith	Mobilitie, LLC
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time Warner Cable
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel Corporation/Sprint Communications CO.L.P
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Barry Consulter	AT&T California
Mr. Troy Stanard	AT&T California
Mr. Todd Dailey	AT&T California
Ms. Veronica Romero	AT&T California
Ms. Joy Young	AT&T California
Mr. Alvin Robielos	AT&T California
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Richard Soriano	City of Banning
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Ms. Yvonne Johnson	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Nicholas Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Ms. Claudia Arellano	City of Vernon
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Services Inc.
Ms. Amanda Lindgren	City of Glendale
Mr. Kenneth Haley	Sonic Telecom, LLC
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff
Ms. Anali Spencer	Committee Staff

Ms. Ortiz called the meeting to order at 11:01 a.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Review of prior month’s minutes - Ms. Ortiz opened the meeting by inquiring if there were any questions or concerns regarding the previous meeting minutes. There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 2 – Interpretation of Routine Handbook – Ms. Ortiz opened the discussion to the members for any questions regarding the Routine Handbook. There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 3 – Item 1597: Review of Routine Handbook Examples (5/19/2015) – Ms. Ortiz reopened the discussion on Review of Routine Handbook Examples. Ms. Ortiz asked if Ms. Black had any updates to the pull from billing examples. Ms. Black stated she did and hopefully she captured everyone’s requests. Ms. Black stated that what she changed from last month was that she put a reason and number four was taken off for the first section making it one, two, and three. Then for the next section the number four gets added. Mr. Bacon asked what happens if the two members cannot resolve the issue. Ms. Black stated she does not think AT&T California has had that happen and asked if any members did. No members had any experiences to share. Mr. Bacon stated that for any issues they would probably bring it to the committee and resolve them that way. Ms. Black asked if there were any objections to move this to Discussion. Ms. Ortiz stated there were no objections and this could be added to next month’s Discussion calendar. Ms. Ortiz opened to Example 35 which she worked on (see attached). She stated the example was just adding a note to make it clear how proposed side of the pending JPA would reflect the record side of the JPA created after that one. Ms. Ortiz asked the members if there were any objections or corrections. Ms. Pranata asked if they would be keeping the same example images below. Ms. Black stated that there are certain companies that may not understand this with just the verbiage, Ms. Black stated that maybe if they find an example with the bill first and then split the example as they did with the pull from billing example just reviewed, they would be able to see the JPA that has it in the proposed becoming the record of the next one. Ms. Black asked the members if this was enough to understand without any examples being presented. Ms. Ortiz stated that the final should not be prepared until the pending JPA final bills. Ms. Black stated she was talking about the Form 2. Ms. Black stated that she can take on doing an example that shows the Form 2 because it is something that she has needed to explain to her people. Ms. Black stated that possibly Example 2 could be used for what Ms. Black was looking for. Mr. Van Stryk stated that instead of using the word JPAs to use Form 2, but as he thought about it JPAs included Form 7’s as well. Ms. Ortiz stated it would include any changes made through a Form 7. Ms. Black asked if the members were good with sending this over to Discussion. There were no objections from any of the members.

There were no further comments or concerns at this time.

Agenda Item 4 - Item 1782: Attachment Acquisition and Tenancy/Lease Conversion (from Crown Castle – E. Carrion – 11/17/2021)

– Ms. Ortiz opened the discussion to Attachment Acquisition and Tenancy/Lease Conversion. She stated that this was approved and now the members needed to work on the example that was previously shown.

Ms. Pranata stated she had a question on this item and the same question went for the other changes approved previously. She stated the members never discussed the effective date. She asked if the members wanted the Routine Handbook updated right away or if the changes are to be postponed until January 1, 2023. Mr. Bacon stated that was still a half a year away and that they should be updated before that. Ms. Ortiz agreed, especially Section 13.4. Ms. Pranata stated she would update Sec 13.4 and asked to confirm if it was the same for the other changes that were approved in the previous months. Ms. Ortiz stated yes to all of them.

Ms. Ortiz asked if the members they wanted to review the example for Attachment Acquisition. Mr. Carrion stated that he may have to take the examples back to the drawing board after some discussion between AT&T California and Crown Castle about possibly separating the two scenarios involved. He stated that maybe they could close Item 1782 at this time and reopen a new number when the new examples are ready to be showcased. Ms. Pranata suggested to add a bullet under Item 1597 to create an example for the new Section 13.4. Mr. Carrion stated it may be a while for the example and he would be more comfortable closing Item 1782 and then revisit when the examples are ready. Ms. Ortiz asked if there were any objections to this. There were no concerns from any of the members.

Agenda Item 5 - Item 1783: Lat and Long on the Form 2 (from Administrative Board – 2/16/2022).

– Ms. Ortiz opened to lat./long. on the Form 2. She asked if the members wanted to look at the Form 50 first because there were some changes made to it (see attached). Ms. Ortiz stated she added the to and the from and below the lists she added the approval dates, approved by and the other side she included date for denial, denied by, and the reason for denial. Ms. Pranata asked if she could add row number on the left side. The members stated it was ok. Ms. LaFrenais asked if they ever added to the Routine Handbook the number of characters that lat./long. needed to be. Ms. Black explained that was in the verbiage that will be discussed after reviewing the Form 50 which she updated. Mr. Bacon asked how they could put a limit on the lat./long. numbers. Ms. LaFrenais stated it was a minimum they were discussing. Ms. Black stated that the format was included and then requested was a certain amount of digits that was most accurate. Ms. Ortiz asked if the members had any other changes. Ms. Pranata stated that there was a question on the chat from Ms. Walsh about the new column, “What is the difference between Unique ID and No.?” She stated it was just a row number not a pole number. Ms. Ortiz added it was in order to be able to quickly see how many poles

were listed on the form. Mr. Bacon asked what would go under the “Unique ID” column. Ms. Pranata stated that the SCJPC has multiple pole records in the system due to keeping dead pole records. The pole number would be the same, but the Unique ID would be different. Ms. Black suggested that the header specify “SCJPC Unique ID.” Ms. Ortiz stated that there was also verbiage for the example (see attached). Ms. Pranata asked if the members would like to add that the GPS coordinates should be in WGS84 format so that it matches Section 15. Ms. Ortiz stated that was a good idea and that it could be added to numbers three and four. Ms. Ortiz asked the members if they had any changes or questions on the verbiage. There were none. Ms. Ortiz stated that there was one more part to review which was the proposed Section 18.11 (see attached). Mr. Bacon asked if they were still asking if there was to be a timeframe. He stated that he did not see any need for a timeline that they did not need to agree. Ms. Ortiz stated that she believed there should be some type of timeline so they can expect a notification telling them their request was approved or denied for whatever reason. Mr. Bacon stated that if they put a time limit and there is no response then there the lat./long. would remain the same. Ms. Ortiz stated that no changes will be made unless they receive a response. Ms. Ortiz asked the members if they thought there should be a timeframe. Ms. DeBarge stated this reminded her of the Form 49 tracer form that has no time limit, and she believes there should be a time frame otherwise it gets ignored and put to the side. Mr. Bacon suggested 45 days and Mr. Treepaisan stated he agreed with that. There were no objections to a 45-day timeline. Ms. Pranata stated there was a question in the chat from Ms. Walsh if the members are going to seek recovery for the field visits. Mr. Bacon stated that the member that is setting the pole, their records will need to indicate the lat./long. and going out to the field to reverify he does not think should be a shared cost because the information should be online and if they do need to go out and verify they can ask if they can charge and see if they agree or disagree. Mr. Ortiz agreed because having lat./long. on the record will help all the members. Mr. Van Stryk stated he does not think they will need to go and double check because the location that has been used in the past will not be changed. He stated as long as the dot on the lat./long. is within a reasonable distance or they can tell if they are closer to their cluster, the only time it would come up as an issue is if they actually need to change the address would require a Section 13 and not a Form 50. Ms. Ortiz asked if there were any suggestion on how to work the time limit for the time frame or if they could write “responses to be sent within 45 days.” There were no other suggestions. Ms. Ortiz asked if there were any objections to adding this to Discussion for July. There were no objections to this.

Ms. Black asked if the members would like eliminate GPS for lat./long. Ms. Black stated that Ms. Ortiz used lat./long. but that she used GPS because there was already something in Section 15 with GPS. Ms. Black’s example was displayed for the members to review (see attached) and asked that they just know that GPS could be changed to lat./long. Ms. Smith stated she agreed to keep everything consistent. Ms. Ortiz asked what was preferred was GPS or lat./long. Ms. Smith stated she preferred lat./long. Ms. DeBarge if “but are highly

recommended” could be removed from the note. Mr. Bacon asked if when Ms. Black stated about it being redundant if she was talking about adding lat./long. and geographic location. Ms. Black stated what she wanted to sync up was the verbiage to pick one either lat./long or GPS coordinates because she used GPS coordinates while Ms. Ortiz used lat./long. Ms. LaFrenais stated she likes keeping it optional to use lat./long. and/or the address because in Big Bear there a lot of poles in the middle of the woods but if there is a street they will use both. Mr. Bacon stated that it is a necessity to have the option to have both, but when there is a typo to the GPS coordinate where numbers are transposed, they will not be near the location. Ms. Ortiz stated that location is required but that the lat./long. that will be optional. Ms. Black stated she did not know that anybody would be putting GPS coordinates on a Form 2 if it is already on the website. Ms. Smith stated that she thinks it should be one or the other and she prefers lat./long. but using either or was fine as long as it was the same one. Mr. Bacon stated that he thinks it would be better if they go with lat./long. Ms. Black stated that she will sync all her documents to say lat./long. and if the members are ok to send this to discussion without bringing it back to ad hock she would do the one change of removing “but are highly recommended” and updating to lat./long. Mr. Carrion stated that lat./long. are expressions of GPS Coordinates and that GPS Coordinates did seem like the appropriate term. Mr. Bacon asked if they could put GPS (lat./long.). Mr. Carrion stated that lat./long. are what GPS Coordinates are. Mr. Bacon asked if what Mr. Carrion was explaining was for the industry standard GPS Coordinates is what the everyone understands to be lat./long. Mr. Carrion stated that was correct. Ms. Pranata asked if everything was going to read GPS Coordinates or just GPS. Mr. Carrion stated it had to read as GPS Coordinates. Ms. Ortiz stated she would update her forms and asked if the members wanted to see the changes before sending to discussion or if it could be switched but still added to discussion. Ms. Smith stated that she had a question about removing “but highly recommended” from Section 15.4-B GPS Coordinates because it was removed from the other. Ms. Black inquired why Ms. Smith had an issue with the words “but highly recommended” on Section 15.4-B because it is saying the current record does not have it. Ms. Smith stated she does not have a problem with it but that because it was removed on the other example that they previously discussed. Ms. Black stated she agreed removing on the other example made sense, but that sentence went to explain that this one is off of a record that does not have it on the pole record yet. Ms. Smith stated that then it was fine. Ms. Pranata confirmed it was not going to strike “but highly recommended.” Ms. LaFrenais stated she uses it all the time. Mr. Bacon stated that he does not like to give it as an option and thinks they should start to include it, that this would fall mostly on the base owners. Mr. Bacon asked how the members felt about making it a requirement versus keeping it as optional. Mr. Treepaisan stated that if it is available to input it but keep it optional so that members are not obligated to dig it up or create it. Mr. Bacon stated that for Bear Valley they do not have addresses from main streets for many poles and GPS Coordinates are the best way to go about it. Ms. Black stated that this has been going back and forth for several months and that there

were some members who really wanted the optional words listed because she does not think that all base owners want to make this a requirement. This is after all her many edits. Mr. Bacon stated that was fair enough and they could just hope that everyone does it. Ms. Mitwasi stated that SCE would like to keep it optional. The members agreed to move this to Discussion.

Ms. Pranata stated she added the bullet regarding Section 15.4 required on Final when location is lat./long. only (no public land survey address available) per email discussions with Ms. Black. Ms. Black stated that this may become its own item number and that she did not have an example yet to see what the members would like to do. She stated that for the public land surveys that are in the middle of nowhere and hard to find. She stated the members had agreed some time ago that when those came up it was acceptable to replace the township/public survey address with GPS Coordinates. She stated verbiage was never put in the Routine Handbook. She stated Ms. Pranata supplied the minutes for it and she stated that she knows SCE & possibly Bear Valley have them as well. She stated if the member agreed that was an acceptable exception to having an address, she could write up an example. Mr. Harmon stated that they could refer to it as the open space type of address for rural or non-developed areas. Ms. Black stated that AT&T California's internal GPS system used to have a layer that was for the open space or public land survey but that they lost that layer which is when they asked if they could get the lat./long. for everything. Ms. Black stated she will come back with example of what was there before and what is being proposed. She stated this will need its own item number.

Agenda Item 6 - Item 1784: Engineered Steel Poles (from Administrative Board - 2/16/2022). - Ms. Ortiz opened to Engineered Steel Poles. Ms. Mitwasi stated that SCE still had their technical resources looking at this and asked if this could be tabled for another month. Ms. Black stated that she did not send this out to anyone but SCE and Bear Valley and wanted to know if there were any other members that would like to participate in the editing of the verbiage before it goes into the Routine Handbook. Ms. Black asked if Ms. Pranata could send it out to all the members so that no one is left out. Ms. Pranata asked if Ms. Black wanted it to go out to all members or just the Routine Revision attendees from today's meeting. Mr. Harmon stated it should be to all members because they all have the opportunity to be a base owner and set a pole. Mr. Harmon stated that from a wireless perspective, cities are into engineered steel poles and that it would technically be in the public right of way and theoretically be subject to a purchase agreement. Ms. Black stated that if any members do have an edit to forward it out to all the members so they could be prepared to discuss it at the next month's meeting.

Agenda Item 7 - Item 1786: Standardized Electronic Delivery of Forms (from SCE - A. DeBarge - 3/16/2022). - Ms. Ortiz opened Standardized Electronic Delivery of Forms which Ms. DeBarge was going to work on proposed verbiage for this item. Ms. DeBarge stated she did not work on it and that SCE would actually like to close the item out without completing it. She stated SCE

originally came and asked as a courtesy that when sending forms, they be named a certain way. She stated some members requested for this to be written up so that it could go into the Routine Handbook as something official. After a lengthy discussion in April, she stated it sounded like there were several members that did not want a naming convention for forms and SCE wanted to close this out. Ms. Ortiz asked if there were any objections to closing this out. Mr. Bacon stated that he had already converted his staff to it. Ms. DeBarge stated that they could continue to use it because most members are already doing this, and it is a good practice to use but that as making it a standard for everyone in the Routine Handbook it did not sound like something that all the members would want. Ms. Ortiz stated that this item will be closed.

Agenda Item 8 - Miscellaneous Issues -

- Ms. Black worked on the proposed verbiage for Section 15.5 for Fire Mesh changes. Ms. Black stated she worked on this and sent it to the members that she knew placed fire mesh (see attached). Ms. LaFrenais found a typo to be fixed. Ms. LaFrenais stated she also sent Ms. Black all the data she could find on the fire mesh. Ms. Black stated that she was unable to read and enlarge it. Ms. Black stated that the document had *G zero 95* instead of GO 95. Ms. Pranata stated the document did not have the “GO” and Ms. Black stated it was possibly in the engineered steel documents where the error was which she could go back and find. Ms. Mitwasi stated that if this could be tabled for SCE because they did not have the opportunity to review it. Ms. Black asked if any other members needed this or if Ms. Pranata could also forward this to all members. Ms. LaFrenais stated that they would need to put some of this verbiage in the glossary. Ms. Black stated that they could put the verbiage from the bottom into the glossary if the members agreed. Ms. Pranata asked to confirm that this would be sent to all the members and not only the Routine Revision attendees. Ms. Black agreed for it to be sent to all the members. She stated there could be a member that is considering placing fire mesh which would give them the opportunity to provide feedback as well.
- Ms. Ortiz opened to adding the definition of Free Attachment to the Routine Handbook and Mr. Bacon was going to work on one. Mr. Bacon stated that he did work on one and that he would probably need some help from the members (see attached). Mr. Bacon stated that a Free Attachment to him when for example in an alley where they get their main line on one side and have to go and serve someone that is on the other side. The pole that is on the other side if there is enough room, GO 95, they can attach to the that pole to serve. The service that feeds the house on the

other side of the alley, that pole to get the access to that and keep everything GO 95 correct would typically be a Free Attachment. The Free Attachment is defined as allowing another member to attach to an existing pole at no charge with several conditions. He stated while working on this he also thought about this being used for a service attachment as a direct path to a POA (point of attachment) where it attaches to the customers entry point/feed point that will serve their customer and when the free attachment pole allows for service and plans for all GO 95 requirements. Mr. Bacon stated that another scenario could be when they have a distribution station where they may have three poles that are in succession of each other within fifteen feet apart. Typically, they would have the members attach to all three poles, but the first pole they would attach, and the remaining would be like a free attachment. He stated another example would be an interset pole that is benefiting utility number one and they interset a pole. He asked if the members had any additions or recommendation for this. Ms. Mitwasi stated she would like to take this back for her SCE team to review. He stated if there are any things to be added and to see if there is an example that they could also come up for a free attachment. He asked where do they draw the line for a free attachment where they are not billing. He stated if it is a feed line going across the alley to feed a pole and then they break off from where their services, that would be considered an attachment because it is mostly for services. Whether it be a single drop or a J hook. He asked if the members agreed as to this being what a free attachment would entail. Mr. Van Stryk stated he would be stricter by saying one service drop wire that would not affect pole loading to a certain extent, no longer than a couple of spans. Mr. Bacon stated that there could be a situation where a house up on a hill could have two or three spans to service, but that there should be an end point which would be the last pole. He asked the communication groups if they would run multiple spans for service drops or if that should be a free attachment. Or if they only get one pole at the end of the line or the closest pole as a free attachment. Mr. Harmon stated it would be the last pole, the service pole versus clearance poles. The free attachment would imply there is no end goal with that. If they are asking for a free attachment or a pole is being set but they do not have a purpose for it but are forced to be attached, then the free attachment would be appropriate. He stated that GO 95 has limitations on services anyway like service spans with 150 maximum. Mr. Bacon asked Ms. Pranata to forward this to the members review and add. He stated that the point of it being in compliance with the loading for free attachment would need to

be added as an excerpt. Ms. Pranata confirmed to send to all members. Mr. Bacon agreed.

- Ms. Ortiz opened to Non conformance/Form 11 moved from Compliance. She asked if any members would like to take this on. Ms. Mitwasi stated she could take it on.
- Ms. Ortiz opened to Steel Stubbing from Mr. Armstrong. He was not on the call, and this was tabled for the next month's Routine Revision meeting.

Agenda Item 9 – Review of Action items/JPA Alerts –

- All the examples for the GPS Coordinates will be added to July's Discussion calendar.
- Item 1782 will be closed.
- The proposed verbiage for Item 1784 will be sent to the membership for review and are to come back with any feedback next month.
- The proposed verbiage for Fire Mesh will be sent to the membership for review and are to come back with any feedback next month.
- The proposed verbiage for Free Attachment will be sent to the membership for review and are to come back with any feedback next month.
- Per SCE's request Item 1786 will be closed.
- Ms. Mitwasi to work on the revised Form 11.
- Steel Stubbing was tabled for next month.

The Meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m. until July 20, 2022.

Anali Spencer – Committee Staff

**FORM 7 - JOINT POLE MEMORANDUM
PULL FINAL BILL FROM BILL CYCLE
EXAMPLE xx**

(1) Protest Form 7's, are discussed in Section 18. Specifics are found in 18.1-B (2) (c), (d) & (e).

be removed from. The reason to stop billing must be included.

(2) For this transaction, the SCJPC Office must be listed under Carbon Copy TO:

(4) U1 and U2 should work together to resolve the issue. When resolved, U1 would resend the F7 with a "Resolved - OK TO BILL, and date" on it and email it to SCJPC Office.

(3) Requesting member (U1) should list the JPA No and list the Bill Cycle the final bill is to

Utility	Representative/Signature	Phone No.	J/P MEMORANDUM FORM 7 Used for additions, deletions or changes to Authorizations (See Section 18.1C)	Date: 1/3/2022
To: U2				JPA No: U2-123456
To:				Job No:
To:				
From: U1				
Dist./Exc.: 2				
Carbon Copies To: SCJPC Office			☐ SEE JPA PRELIMINARY ATTACHED	
☐ ADD	☐ CORRECT TO READ	☐ CHANGE LOCATION TO READ		
☐ DELETE	☐ CANCEL JPA	☐ REMOVE TEMPORARY ATTACHMENT FROM RECORD		
Remarks: 3				
Please remove Final Bill U2-123456 from billing cycle 1-22-U234, because U1 Form 2 changes are not entered on the FB.				

After U1 and U2 work the issue out: Resend the same Form 7, stating OK to bill. See (4).

Utility	Representative/Signature	Phone No.	J/P MEMORANDUM FORM 7 Used for additions, deletions or changes to Authorizations (See Section 18.1C)	Date: 1/3/2022
To: U2				JPA No: U2-123456
To:				Job No:
To:				
From: U1				
Dist./Exc.: 2				
Carbon Copies To: SCJPC Office			☐ SEE JPA PRELIMINARY ATTACHED	
☐ ADD	☐ CORRECT TO READ	☐ CHANGE LOCATION TO READ		
☐ DELETE	☐ CANCEL JPA	☐ REMOVE TEMPORARY ATTACHMENT FROM RECORD		
Remarks: 3				
Please remove Final Bill U2-123456 from billing cycle 1-22-U234, because U1 Form 2 changes are not entered on the FB.				
Resolved 3-30-22. OK for U2 to Final Bill.				
			4	

13.4 Records update for attachment acquisition and tenancy/lease conversion

In the event that a Member's network, or portion thereof, is acquired by that of another Member, or when a Member wishes to convert a tenant attachment(s) into ownership, the transfer or establishment of new ownership for an existing attachment is to be conducted via a JPA Form 2.

Pole Loading is not required, unless additional work or load is applied in conjunction with the transfer of ownership or tenant conversion. In instances where an attachment cannot be verified with an existing ownership record or lease agreement, the attachment will be considered unauthorized, and must be transferred or converted under the appropriate section 4.

Upon finalization of the JPA will the following apply:

- Transfer of ownership(s) will be deemed complete.
- Prior tenant/lease agreements for converted attachments may be cancelled, and is the sole responsibility of the Member initiating the conversion.

Discussed in Compliance Meeting 02/16/2022

Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization

Member utility acquisition of network

Example XX

This transaction shows U3 purchasing the space of an acquired network, bringing said space into U3-ownership. The example involving pole 123456-U1 shows U3 purchasing U2's attachment space in whole, as part of an acquisition agreement. This example includes a notation indicating the removal of purchase costs between U3 and U2.

The example involving pole 56789-U1 shows U3 purchasing the space of an attachment previously made under a tenant agreement, converting it into U3-ownership. This example includes notation indicating the purchase intent as to convert the existing tenant attachment into Member utility ownership.

Date
Prepared

ITEM 1782
1/1/2020

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT POLE TRANSACTION

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

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

Date
Sent

1/2/2020

Confirming
Agreement

☐ In Field
☐ By
☐ By Email
Phone

Est.
Const.
Start

No. of
Pages

1

J.P.
Auth.No.

U3-12345

UTILITY	REPRESENTATIVE	PHONE NUMBER OR EMAIL	DISTRICT-DIVISION-EXCHANGE	APPROVED	ACCOUNTING DATA
U1	Jane Doe				
U2	Jon Doe				
U3	Jack Johnson	555-555-5555	Los Angeles	E Carrion	REF111111

POLE NO.	Pole Length Anchor Size	Year Set	Pole Trt	Record					Proposed					Item No.	LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK If not in accordance with Joint Pole agreement and routine-state reasons.
			Class	U1	U2				U1	U2	U3				
			Anchor Direct.												
				16KV	C				16KV	C	C				U3 PURCH, U2 RELINQ SEC 4.2 1
123456-U1	50	81	FT	43 - 9 27 - 9	28 - 1				43 - 9 27 - 9		28 - 1				LARGEWOOD AVE N/S 10' W/O FRANCE ST 2
															NO COST BETWEEN U3 AND U2 3
															4
				16KV	C				16KV	C	C				U3 PURCH SEC 4.0 5
56789-U1	50	98	FT	43 - 9 28 - 10	29 - 1				43 - 9 27 - 9	29 - 1	28 - 1				LARGEWOOD AVE N/S 75' W/O FRANCE ST 6
															U3 PURCHASE TO CONVERT EXIST TN ATTCH INTO U3-OWNERSHIP 7
															8
															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

COMMUNITY

VP/J.P.-03

Rev. Oct 2017

New section.

15.4- B GPS Coordinates

The GPS Coordinates, when known, can be listed under the 15.4 Pole Location Address on the LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK side of the Form 2. The coordinates should be 6 to 8 digits (8 being most accurate) and be formatted to WGS84 standard. Adding the GPS coordinates is optional but highly recommended when the existing pole record does not list it. See Example xx in Section 18, page 18-xx.

Under Section 18.1 A – add red below

RECORD FORMS

18.0 Record Forms

The forms used for expediting joint pole work and recording transactions are listed below:

Form #	Form Name
2-1	Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization
2-2	Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization
2-1 FINAL	Final Joint Pole Authorization
2-2 FINAL	Final Joint Pole Authorization
Form 7	Joint Pole Memorandum
Form 9	Joint Pole Riser Notification
Form 11	Notice of GO 95 Non-Conformance
Form 12	Pole Record
Form 16	Reallocation of Space
Form 44	Bill of Sale
Form 48	Notice of Work Completed
Form 49	Tracer

Hard or soft copies shall be provided as agreed by the parties.

(Revised January 2015)

18.1 Form 2 - Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization

Any agreement to undertake joint work must be confirmed in writing by using this form. This is authority to undertake joint work as specified. Member initiating transaction shall make necessary copies for each Member involved, all of which must be approved by an authorized representative of each involved Member. Approval may be by signature of the authorized representative to be shown on the forms in the space provided, or by the authorized representative's name, followed by the written initials of a delegated representative confirming the agreement. Names of representatives effecting agreement must be specified in space provided. Members that have various designated District, Division, or Exchange areas should identify the appropriate area by name. The Joint Pole Authorization number is assigned by the issuing Member. The Joint Pole Authorization number should begin with the Initiator's Member code and can have a maximum of 23 alpha or numeric characters only. The only exceptions are blank spaces or hyphens within the 23 maximum character count. If the Form 2 is revised, characters like RO1 or COR are not included in the maximum 23-character count for the F2 name (Revised March 2021).

18.1-A Preparation of Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization

By agreement, any Member may be designated as the constructing Member in joint work.

The Member initiating Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization shall specify its Authorization number and all required details of the agreement. The Joint Pole Authorization number shall begin with the current member's code. The Form 2 shall include, but is not limited to:

- (a) Pole Number
- (b) Nature of work
- (c) Applicable Routine Section Number
- (d) Designation of involved Members
- (e) Circuits
- (f) Interest
- (g) Grade
- (h) Space
- (i) Pole/equipment data, including jointly owned arms, anchors, risers, wireless and broadband equipment.
- (j) Other essential record data i.e. tenants, power communication (**P.Comm**)
- (k) Authorized Costs item number and number of items where required
- (l) Police and/or fire report or case number when applicable and available
- (m) Provide billing information when applicable billing sections are used
- (n) Estimated construction start date
- (o) Date sent
- (p) Date prepared
- (q) Pole Class for wood poles
- (r) Additional notes such as pending JPA numbers or corrections per field conditions
- (s) Pole loading analysis only for poles associated with the JPA. NOTE: (1) Members cannot dictate pole loading method and format however must meet all GO95 requirements (2) Section 4.1 refer to the section.
- (t) Optional drawing/map: highlight only the poles associated with the JPA (Revised June 2020).
- (u) **GPS coordinates. (Optional)**

The Preliminary Form 2 shall be limited to 10 pages.

Where a specific transaction involves special agreement, it shall be designated as such on Joint Pole Authorization. (See Section 1.2)

It is the responsibility of all Members involved in the Joint Pole Authorization to see that data and details of the agreement are correct. The date Joint Pole Authorization is sent shall be used in completing the billing for structural and salvage values; except in replacements, the date poles are set shall apply.

Any deviation shall be by agreement of the Members involved and noted on the Joint Pole

Engineered Steel RH verbiage changes

3.14 Notice of Intention to Construct Other than Wood Pole.

If constructing Member, to accommodate other members' requirements, is involved in expense exceeding that required for its facilities when alone, purchase of interest by Member desiring to participate in joint ownership shall be made when poles and anchors have been installed according to approved plan.

Section 1.2 required for Engineered Steel Poles (Revised January 2008). (See loading requirement notes in Section 15.4, for ES-1 and ES-2 poles.)

7.3 Overbuild

This section provides for the replacement of a solely owned or a jointly owned pole, less than 25 years old for the sole benefit of an incoming Member or one joint owner. This section also applies to poles replaced due to damage caused by facilities of a joint owner, poles replaced due to California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) mandates directed at specific member facilities, and to all solely owned or jointly owned poles replaced for the sole benefit of Members

having less than 20 consecutive years of Joint Pole Committee membership.

The cost to benefiting Member shall include:

- (a) Equity of overbuilt Member's structural value of existing pole, less salvage
- (b) Cost of transfer
- (c) Additional material installed to comply with requirements of joint ownership
- (d) Sidewalk or pavement repairs
- (e) Entire removal cost

The sole owner, or each joint owner as appropriate, shall bill the benefiting Member for the portion of pulling and transportation it performs. The Member recovering pole shall allow salvage to other owner(s) for its relinquished interest. Member placing new pole shall bill an interest to other Members.

When a benefiting Member replaces pole and another Member desires additional grade or space, replacement shall be made in accordance with rule of the Routine relating to Section 7.11. Mutual benefit shall not apply where a non-benefiting owner is forced to increase grade or space as a result of the activities undertaken by the benefiting Member.

7.14 Replacement of Wood Pole with Other than Wood Pole.

Member replacing wood pole with other than wood pole for mutual benefit, shall sell interest in new pole to other Members concerned. Each member shall transfer at own expense, receive salvage, and pay pulling and transportation. Mutual benefit shall be understood to apply under this section as follows:

- (a) Pole 25 years old or more

ITEM 1784 ENGINEERED STEEL POLES

- (b) Pole less than 25 years old, but rendered unfit for service by any cause not the fault of a joint owner including existing overloaded poles. (Revised April 2015)
- (c) Pole requiring relocation for the benefit of all Members concerned
- (d) Pole identified in authorized maintenance inspection program as unfit for service
- (e) Pole requiring replacement for clearing of discovered existing General Order 95 infractions not the fault of any joint owner.
- (f) Pole replaced prior to Form 2 and Form 48. Form 2 must be noted that this is a Priority Pole. Section 7.13 applies only if Form 2 is not issued within 45 days. (Revised February 2017)
- (g) Pole replacements initiated to fulfill CPUC mandated requirements directed to Members with specific facilities, shall be Section 7.3.

For poles that are more than 25 years old, this section applies only to Members having more than 20 consecutive years of Joint Pole Committee membership.

For those Members with less than 20 consecutive years of Joint Pole Committee membership, which initiates the replacement of poles under the provisions of (a) above, Section 7.3 shall apply.

This rule shall also apply where owner failed to issue Notice of Intention for pole and incoming Member desires its replacement within three years, beginning with January 1 following date of its installation. If pole has been installed longer than the three-year period specified and is not more than 25 years old, the replacement shall be in accordance with rule of the Routine relating to Section 7.3.

Section 1.2 required for Engineered Steel Poles. (See loading requirement notes in Section 15.4, for ES-1 and ES-2 poles.)

Note: The setting member will PTD other than wood poles.
(Revised January 2011).

15.5 Alternative To Wood Poles

CF (Composite Fiberglass – single piece)

CM (Composite Fiberglass – multi pieces)

LS (Lightweight Steel)

HS (Heavy Steel)

CP (Concrete Pole)

DI (Ductile Iron)

HD (Heavy Ductile Iron)

ES-1 (Engineered Steel – Additional load can be added per GO 95 Rule 44.3, see note below regarding “reserve load” being required.) **Member claiming a “NO more additional load” as reason for denial of access shall provide denied member a written rejection of their attachment request with proof that this additional load shall lower the Safety Factor to below the GO 95 minimums.

ES-2 (Engineered Steel – Ok to add additional load.)

Notation: Engineered Steel poles require Section 1.2. Any Member setting an ES-1 Engineered Steel pole as a replacement to a Wood pole must incur all cost above and beyond the cost to install a wood pole that would have met the 4.0 safety factor. New ES-1 Pole setting member can share cost above and beyond a 4.0 SF wood pole if that member can show a CPUC authority allowing such action. These costs can also be shared thru mutual agreement and a Section 1.2. New ES-1 Pole setting member must send all other occupying members a final set of Loading Calculations that contain values that show a minimum 1.5 Safety Factor on the steel structure, a

ITEM 1784 ENGINEERED STEEL POLES

2.0 Safety Factor for overturn-*Lateral Bearing* and a 1.5 Safety Factor when calculating uplift. Soil inspection reports and tested values shall also be provided upon demand as a part of any GO 95 Rule 44.4 request. The Safety factors derived from final loads (Kips, KSF) shall be stamped by a Civil PE. Any Form 2 initiating an ES-1 pole (either solely or joint) after xxxx, 202x that does not add in this reserve load, the base owner will need to replace the ES-1 pole as a 7.3 upon a new Member applying for ownership.

(Revised January 2008). (LS & CP revised June 2008). (DI, CM added January 2011). (HS,HD added October 2013).

ITEM 1786

Fw: ELECTRONIC DELIVERY OF FORMS

Angela Pranata Meeting Laptop <laptop01@scjpc.net>

Wed 4/6/2022 11:52 AM

To: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>

From: April DeBarge <April.Debarge@sce.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2022 12:08 PM
To: Angela Pranata Meeting Laptop <laptop01@scjpc.net>
Cc: Valerie Mitwasi <Valerie.Mitwasi@sce.com>; Alicia Walsh <Alicia.Walsh@sce.com>
Subject: ELECTRONIC DELIVERY OF FORMS

Hi Team.

We have automated our inbox and are experiencing difficulty identifying the document type for scripting.

We are asking that the members use a standard naming convention of their document when returning a form associated to the JPA.

Per our discussion today, we are proposing the below.

NAMING PROCEDURE RETURNING SIGNED COPY AND SUPPORTING DOCS TO INITIATING MEMBER

When returning forms to initiating member, please use standard naming convention:

- JPA#_DOC NAME_ MEMBER TAG
 - Examples:
 - EXXXX-XXXXXXXXX_SIGNED COPY_YOUR MEMBER CODE
 - EXXXX-XXXXXXXXX_F7_YOUR MEMBER CODE
 - EXXXX-XXXXXXXXX_F48_YOUR MEMBER CODE
- Documents should only contain one form type:
 - A Form 7 PDF should not contain a signed copy or Form 48, and vice versa.

Previous alert regarding electronic delivery of forms

06/20/2018 Alert: EMAIL GUIDELINES FOR FORMS / EMAIL NAMING PROCEDURE

Discussed in 6/20/2018 Admin Board meeting:

Subject line: FULLJPANumber_FormName(s) Community
Subject line: FULLJPANumber FormName(s) Community
(may use underscore or space for Subject line)

Subject line for Tier 2 (or Tier 3): FULLJPANumber FormName(s) Community T2 (or T3)

Community: From Page 1 Footer of the JPA.

Only one JPA# per email.

Total of all attached files size: 5MB maximum (note: if exceeds the size limit must split email to 'Email 1 of x', 'Email 2 of x', etc.).

Suggestions when size exceeds limit: Compress to zip file, resize the PDF, send PDF pictures instead of jpgs.

LADWP: Max 10MB
AT&T CA Request: Pictures

Examples:
Subject line: U1254-5879548_F2 Los Angeles
Subject line: U6-7589_F7 Downey
Subject line: U1254-5879548_F2_F48 Los Angeles

EXTERNAL SUBMISSIONS (FOR ROUTINE HANDBOOK)-This would be a requirement, not optional

Standard Naming Convention for Electronic Delivery of Forms

Initiating a Preliminary JPA Submission to Member

When submitting a preliminary JPA to member inbox, the initiating member must use the standard naming convention. **Submissions should be in PDF format.**

- Full JPA#_DOCUMENT TYPE for each document submitted:
 - U1JPA#_JP2: Preliminary JPA
 - **Suggestion from ATT CA: U1JPA#_F2**
 - U1JPA#_PL: Pole Loading
- Other documents that may be submitted by the initiating member throughout the JPA process:
 - U1JPA#_F7: Form 7
 - U1JPA#_F48: Form 48
 - U1JPA#_MAP: Map
 - U1JPA#_PIC: Pictures
- Documents should only contain one form type:
 - *For example, a _MAP should not contain pictures, and vice versa.*

Returning Documents to Initiating Member

When returning a signed copy or other supporting documents to member inbox, the member must use the standard naming convention. Returned documents should include returning member's member code as part of the naming convention. **Submissions should be in PDF format.** (Spaces or underscores are OK?)

- Full JPA#_DOCUMENT TYPE_MEMBER CODE for each document submitted:
 - U1JPA#_APPROVED_U2: Signed Copy
 - U1JPA#_PARTIALAPPROVED_U2: Partially approved, signed copy
 - U1JPA#_DENIED_U2: Denied Copy
 - U1JPA#_F7_U2: Form 7
 - U1JPA#_F48_U2: Form 48
 - U1JPA#_PL_U2: Pole Loading
 - U1JPA#_MAP_U2: MAP
 - U1JPA#_PIC_U2: Picture
 - U1JPA#_F9_U2: Form 9
- Documents should only contain one form type:
 - *For example, a _MAP PDF should not contain pictures, and vice versa.*

ITEM 1786

Initiating a Form 9 to Member

When submitting a Form 9 to member inbox, the initiating member must use the standard naming convention. **Submissions should be in PDF format.**

- POLE#_DOCUMENT TYPE for each document submitted:
 - U1_ACCOUNTING DATA_F9: Form 9
 - U1_POLE#_F9: Form 9

Email Guidelines

- Only one JPA# per email.
- Subject: JPA#_DOCUMENT TYPE(S) COMMUNITY
 - Underscore or space may be used.
 - Various document types may be submitted for the same JPA#.
 - Tier 2 or Tier 3 submittal:
 - Subject: JPA#_DOCUMENT TYPE(S) COMMUNITY T2 (or T3)
- Subject Line Examples:
 - U1XXXX-XXXXXXXXXX_F2 Van Nuys
 - U1XXXX-XXXXXX-XXX F2 F7 Downey
 - U1XX-XXXX-XXXX_F2_F7_F48 San Bernardino
- Where multiple communities may be involved, use the Community from page 1 Footer of the JPA.
- Municipalities are not required to list the community on the Subject Line (except LADWP).
- Email undeliverable:
 - Check accuracy of email address. Resend to correct email address. Date Sent on forms may need to be updated if a day has elapsed.
 - Initiating member is not responsible for revised date sent when member inbox is full or address updated without communication to JPC to update contacts.
 - Check file size: 5 MB is a general size maximum. If file(s) exceed a member's limit,
 - Split the emails into "Email 1 of X, 2 of X, etc)
 - Compress files to zip
- PDF must be the standard format for all forms, including pictures.

Fire Mesh verbiage changes

15.5 Length, Year Set and Treatment of Pole

The length, year set and treatment of pole must be accurately given on Joint Pole Authorization as these data constitute the basis upon which price is fixed for interest in pole in accordance with schedules of structural values. For purposes of type of treatment, they shall be listed on the Joint Pole Authorization as Butt Treated (T), Full Treated (FT), Gray (G) or Additional Treatment (AT).

Types of treatment included in these groupings are as follows. **These category grouping types are required information on a preliminary Form 2:**

T (Butt Treated)

Creosote or Pentachlorophenol

FT (Full Treated) Creosote Pentachlorophenol Cellon - Natural

ColorChemonite

Copper Naphthenate **(No Fire Mesh Wrap added.)**

FTW (Full Treated with Fire Mesh Wrap added)

G (Gray)

Gray Stained - Cellon Gray Stained - Chemonite

Gray Stained - Butt Treated Cedar

AT Methylisothiocyanate-MITC FUME or WoodFume

UltraFume

Disodium octaborate teraglydrate-Tim-borFluorod

Disodium octaborate-Boron rods

15.5-A Additional Treatment of Joint Poles

Mutual agreement must be obtained prior to additional treatment of existing joint poles. The actual Chemical used for additional treatment will be identified on the preliminary joint pole authorization.

Fire Mesh Wrap is specifically designed to withstand wildfires by adding a protective layer, as an additional treatment on the pole. When a Base Owner decides it is necessary, Fire Mesh Wrap can be placed on poles in High Fire Threat District areas. These wrapped poles will have FTW treatment category groupings listed on the preliminary joint pole authorization. **NOTE: Poles with this wrap can be climbed with gaffs or can have pole steps placed on it after the wrap is installed. Prod, Intrusive and Sound testing of the pole is not hampered by the wrap. Any small tears measuring XXXXX done to the wrap, do not need to be repaired. Any tear larger than XXXX is something the base owner would like to repair. The base owners who place this wrap request to be notified of tears larger than XXXXX, via the contact email listed under "Pole Inspection Contacts and Resources" on the spreadsheet labeled "SCJPC Pole Inspection Contacts", on the SCJPC website. For additional information regarding Fire Wrap, please see the Q&A document regarding Fire Wrap under "Pole Inspection Contacts and Resources" under SCE Fire Mesh Wrap Q&A document, on the SCJPC website.**

MISC: FIRE MESH

Do we need something in the glossary?

New section.

15.4- B GPS Coordinates

The GPS Coordinates, when known, can be listed under the 15.4 Pole Location Address on the LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK side of the Form 2. The coordinates should be 6 to 8 digits (8 being most accurate) and be formatted to WGS84 standard. Adding the GPS coordinates is optional but highly recommended when the existing pole record does not list it. See Example xx in Section 18, page 18-xx.

Under Section 18.1 A – add red below

RECORD FORMS

18.0 Record Forms

The forms used for expediting joint pole work and recording transactions are listed below:

Form #	Form Name
2-1	Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization
2-2	Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization
2-1 FINAL	Final Joint Pole Authorization
2-2 FINAL	Final Joint Pole Authorization
Form 7	Joint Pole Memorandum
Form 9	Joint Pole Riser Notification
Form 11	Notice of GO 95 Non-Conformance
Form 12	Pole Record
Form 16	Reallocation of Space
Form 44	Bill of Sale
Form 48	Notice of Work Completed
Form 49	Tracer

Hard or soft copies shall be provided as agreed by the parties.

(Revised January 2015)

18.1 Form 2 - Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization

Any agreement to undertake joint work must be confirmed in writing by using this form. This is authority to undertake joint work as specified. Member initiating transaction shall make necessary copies for each Member involved, all of which must be approved by an authorized representative of each involved Member. Approval may be by signature of the authorized representative to be shown on the forms in the space provided, or by the authorized representative's name, followed by the written initials of a delegated representative confirming the agreement. Names of representatives effecting agreement must be specified in space provided. Members that have various designated District, Division, or Exchange areas should identify the appropriate area by name. The Joint Pole Authorization number is assigned by the issuing Member. The Joint Pole Authorization number should begin with the Initiator's Member code and can have a maximum of 23 alpha or numeric characters only. The only exceptions are blank spaces or hyphens within the 23 maximum character count. If the Form 2 is revised, characters like RO1 or COR are not included in the maximum 23-character count for the F2 name (Revised March 2021).

18.1-A Preparation of Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization

By agreement, any Member may be designated as the constructing Member in joint work.

The Member initiating Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization shall specify its Authorization number and all required details of the agreement. The Joint Pole Authorization number shall begin with the current member's code. The Form 2 shall include, but is not limited to:

- (a) Pole Number
- (b) Nature of work
- (c) Applicable Routine Section Number
- (d) Designation of involved Members
- (e) Circuits
- (f) Interest
- (g) Grade
- (h) Space
- (i) Pole/equipment data, including jointly owned arms, anchors, risers, wireless and broadband equipment.
- (j) Other essential record data i.e. tenants, power communication **(P.Comm)**
- (k) Authorized Costs item number and number of items where required
- (l) Police and/or fire report or case number when applicable and available
- (m) Provide billing information when applicable billing sections are used
- (n) Estimated construction start date
- (o) Date sent
- (p) Date prepared
- (q) Pole Class for wood poles
- (r) Additional notes such as pending JPA numbers or corrections per field conditions
- (s) Pole loading analysis only for poles associated with the JPA. NOTE: (1) Members cannot dictate pole loading method and format however must meet all GO95 requirements (2) Section 4.1 refer to the section.
- (t) Optional drawing/map: highlight only the poles associated with the JPA (Revised June 2020).
- (u) GPS coordinates. (Optional)**

The Preliminary Form 2 shall be limited to 10 pages.

Where a specific transaction involves special agreement, it shall be designated as such on Joint Pole Authorization. (See Section 1.2)

It is the responsibility of all Members involved in the Joint Pole Authorization to see that data and details of the agreement are correct. The date Joint Pole Authorization is sent shall be used in completing the billing for structural and salvage values; except in replacements, the date poles are set shall apply.

Any deviation shall be by agreement of the Members involved and noted on the Joint Pole

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT POLE TRANSACTION

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

Date Prepared 4/14/2014

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

Date Sent 4/16/2014

Confirming Agreement _____

In Field ☐

By Telephone ☐

Est. Const. Start _____

No. of Pages 1

J.P. Auth.No. U3-123-456

UTILITY	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT-DIVISION-EXCHANGE	APPROVED	TAXING INSTRUCTIONS	ACCOUNTING DATA
U1	JONES	LOS ANGELES	JONES	LOS ANGELES	5577303
U2	JOHNSON	LOS ANGELES	JOHNSON	LOS ANGELES	A403
U3	SMITH	LOS ANGELES	SMITH	LOS ANGELES	12345

POLE NO.	Pole Length Anchor Size	Year Set	Pole Trt	Record				Proposed					Item No.	LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK If not in accordance with Joint Pole agreement and routine-state reasons.		
			Class	U1	U2			U1	U2	U3						
			Anchor Direct.													
				L				L						U1 TO REPLACE POLE FOR BENEFIT OF U3 SEC 7.3, 10.8	1	
1234U1	45	02	FT	39-9	24-6			PTD						DREAM RD S/S 212' W/O ONE WAY	2	
			CL-3											33.881958, -118.274545	1	3
								1	1				83	U3 TO PAY U1 & U2 FOR TRANSFER	4	
																5
5678U1	50	14	FT					43-13	23-5	24-1				DREAM RD S/S 211' W/O ONE WAY	6	
														33.881958, -118.274545	2	7
																8
																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

NEVERLAND
COMMUNITY

VP/J.P.-03

Rev. Jul 2013

18.11 Form 50 – GPS Coordinates Addition/Correction

This form is used to notify the base owner of the addition/correction of a joint pole's GPS coordinates.

This form is not to be used for a pole pending on a JPA as the addition/correction is to be addressed on the pending JPA.

The form shall be sent to the base owner for review. If base owner approves the proposed GPS coordinates, the approved form will be returned to the sender and to the SCJPC for pole record update. If the base owner denies the proposed GPS coordinates, a reason will be provided, and form is to be returned to sender.

Response is to be received from base owner within 45 days.

See Example XX, page 18-XX.

FORM 50 – GPS COORDINATES ADDITION/CORRECTION **EXAMPLE XX**

- (1) This form shows a member notifying the pole's base owner of the addition/correction of a joint pole's GPS coordinates.
- (2) All poles listed on form need to be for the same base owner.
- (3) The first entry shows the proposed addition of GPS coordinates (WGS84).
- (4) The second entry shows the proposed correction of GPS coordinates (WGS84).
- (5) If the base owner approves the proposed GPS coordinates, this section is to be completed.
- (6) If the base owner denies the proposed GPS coordinates, this section is to be completed.

FORM 50 **GPS Coordinates Addition/Correction**

	Utility	Representative	Phone No. or E-Mail	
To:	U1	JONES	888-888-8888	Date: 6/2/2022
From:	U2	JOHNSON	888-888-8888	

No.	SCJPC Unique ID	Pole Number	Existing Latitude	New/Updated Latitude	Existing Longitude	New/Updated Longitude
3 → 1	354846	84354U1	N/A	33.515748	N/A	-117.384365
4 → 2	138745	96412U1	34.659587	34.559587	-118.684698	-118.548695
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						

5 → Approved Date: 6/14/2022

5 → Approved By: JONES

5 → Date Sent to SCJPC: 6/14/2022

6 → Denial Date: _____

6 → Denied By: _____

6 → Reason for Denial: _____

- (2) Transfer all data from the Preliminary JPA to the Final JPA.
 - a. APPROVED column should have the approval name or 18.1D.
 - b. Type one item (Item No. or Authorized Costs) per line.
- (3) Leave the Date Completed section empty. The SCJPC office will enter this date.
- (4) Enter the Form 48 date sent.

FORM 50

GPS Coordinates Addition/Correction

Utility Representative Phone No. or E-Mail

To: _____ Date: _____

From: _____

No.	SCJPC Unique ID	Pole Number	Existing Latitude	New/Updated Latitude	Existing Longitude	New/Updated Longitude
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						

Approved Date: _____ Denial Date: _____

Approved By: _____ Denied By: _____

Date Sent to SCJPC: _____ Reason for Denial: _____

Free Attachments

Free attachment is defined as allowing another member to attach to an existing pole at no charge

Free Attachments apply to the following conditions;

To be used for service attachment as a direct path to a point of attachment that will serve their customer and when the Free attachment pole allows for service clearance for all GO.95 requirements. Multiple poles in close proximity the incoming member will pay to attach to the first pole attachment and the successive attachment shall be free (three pole rack)

PRELIMINARY JOINT POLE AUTHORIZATION ADDING GPS COORDINATES TO POLE LOCATIONS EXAMPLE xx

(1) This transaction shows how to add GPS coordinates for a pole location.

Use WGS84 formatting, with 6 to 8 digits, and place under the Section 15.4 pole location address. (8 digits is most accurate.)

(2) When the pole is replaced, it will move one foot on the address line, but using the same GPS coordinates is ok.

NOTE: Adding GPS coordinates are optional, but are highly recommended.

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT POLE TRANSACTION															J.P. FORM 2-1 Preliminary 1/95
Date Prepared		This authorization is in accordance with Joint Pole Agreement and Routine. The undersigned have agreed on joint work as specified hereon.													
Date Sent		Confirming Agreement		In Field ☐		By Telephone ☐		Est. Const. Start		No. of Pages		J.P. Auth. No.			
4/14/2014										1		U3-123-456			
UTILITY	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT-DIVISION-EXCHANGE				APPROVED				TAXING INSTRUCTIONS				ACCOUNTING DATA	
U1	JONES	LOS ANGELES				JONES				LOS ANGELES				5577303	
U2	JOHNSON	LOS ANGELES				JOHNSON				LOS ANGELES				A403	
U3	SMITH	LOS ANGELES				SMITH				LOS ANGELES				12345	

POLE NO.	Pole Length Anchor Size	Year Set	Pole Id. 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			U1	U2	U3				
				L				L					U1 TO REPLACE POLE FOR BENEFIT OF U3 SEC 7.3, 10.8	1
1234U1	45	02	FT	38-9	24-6			PTD					DREAM RD S/S 212' W/O ONE WAY	2
			CL-3										33.881958, -118.274545	1
								1	1				U3 TO PAY U1 & U2 FOR TRANSFER	4
														5
5678U1	50	14	FT					43-13	23-5	24-1			DREAM RD S/S 211' W/O ONE WAY	6
													33.881958, -118.274545	2
														8
														9
														10
														11
														12
														13

POLE LEGEND: L = LOWER TOP (Item SE)
P = PULL (Item SA) C(PX) = FOOTAGE CUT
PB = PULL BUTT SCZ = SAFETY CLEARANCE ZONE
T = TRANSPORT (Item SB)
S = SALVAGE
D = DISPOSE (Item SD)
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

NEVERLAND COMMUNITY

VPJ.P.-03
Rev. Jul 2013

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone (909) 599-3801

July 20, 2022

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, **at 1:02 p.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:**

Ms. Maria Ortiz	XO Communication
Ms. Valerie Mitwasi	Southern California Edison
Ms. Alicia Walsh	Southern California Edison
Ms. Camile Bowie	Southern California Edison
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Mr. Earle Carrion	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Katy White	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications
Ms. Dawn Laffoon	Mobilitie, LLC
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time Warner Cable
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel Corporation/Sprint Communications CO.L.P
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Troy Stanard	AT&T California
Mr. Todd Dailey	AT&T California
Ms. Joy Young	AT&T California
Mr. Richard Soriano	City of Banning
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Ms. Yvonne Johnson	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Nicholas Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Ms. Claudia Arellano	City of Vernon
Ms. Bobola Akerson	City of Burbank
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Services Inc.
Ms. Amanda Lindgren	City of Glendale
Mr. Kenneth Haley	Sonic Telecom, LLC
Ms. Patti Ringo	Sonic Telecom, LLC
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff
Ms. Anali Spencer	Committee Staff

Ms. Ortiz called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Review of prior month’s minutes - Ms. Ortiz opened the meeting by inquiring if there were any questions or concerns regarding the previous meeting minutes. There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 2 – Interpretation of Routine Handbook – Ms. Ortiz opened the discussion to the members for any questions regarding the Routine Handbook. There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 3 – Item 1597: Review of Routine Handbook Examples (5/19/2015) – Ms. Ortiz reopened the discussion on Review of Routine Handbook Examples. She stated that they discussed Pull from Billing and Example 35 at the Administrative Board meeting and asked if there were any other examples the members would like to discuss. Ms. Pranata stated she would like to make a note that both these items will be in the Consent calendar at the Administrative Board next month.

There were no further comments or concerns at this time.

Agenda Item 4 - Item 1783: Lat and Long on the Form 2 (from Administrative Board – 2/16/2022). – Ms. Ortiz opened to the third bullet regarding the Form 50, Section 18.11, and the new Form 50 example. She stated that the Form 50, Section 18.11, and new Form 50 example will be in the Consent Calendar for the Administrative Board next month. Ms. Pranata asked about the second bullet that had to do with GPS Coordinates revisions. Ms. Black stated that was going to be taken offline and that AT&T California had already scheduled a meeting with SCE to discuss and bring a solution to the issues. She asked to leave that bullet on the Discussion Calendar for now at the Administrative Board, but that everything for the third bullet was for Consent.

Agenda Item 5 - Item 1784: Engineered Steel Poles (from Administrative Board – 2/16/2022). - Ms. Ortiz opened to Engineered Steel Poles. Ms. Black stated that there was no feedback emailed to her and asked the members if anyone did have any feedback. Ms. Mitwasi stated that for Section 7.14, letter G, SCE was removing “mandated” and just having the word “requirements” because that states it is a mandated piece of it. She stated that also “directed to members with specific facilities” should be stricken as well and in parenthesis “shall be Section 7.3, when applicable.” Ms. Black took notes to retype this verbiage. Ms. Mitwasi stated that under 15.5 for ES-1 there are additional notes and asked if they could be moved to the notation below to clean it so that all the notations are in one location since no other abbreviations have any notations. She stated regarding the actual note itself it would be striking “**Member claiming” and everything after. Ms. Black stated that this was what Mr. Harmon had added and asked if he was available. Mr. Harmon was unavailable at this time. Ms. Black asked Ms. Mitwasi to send her SCE’s edit’s so she can send them to Mr. Harmon because she did not have any feedback on that. Ms. Mitwasi agreed to send Ms. Black the revision. Ms. Black stated she would reformat these and work with Mr. Harmon on the verbiage. She asked if there were any other things the members would like to strike, change, or reformat. Ms. Mitwasi stated that for the notation section she did have additional strikeouts, but that she can include them with everything she was already going

to send to Ms. Black. Mr. Treepaisan stated that he went through it and did not have a problem with it, but that he did not have a chance to review it with his Frontier team. He stated that he thinks GO 95 has verbiage that is similar with providing some kind of reason or criteria for denials. Ms. Black stated if they already have verbiage that is the same in GO 95, they could ask Mr. Harmon why they need to be specific with it again in. Ms. Black stated she will get with Ms. Mitwasi and Mr. Harmon as soon as she can, make the edits and then send it to the membership so they have a clean updated copy to look at prior to the next meeting to discuss and see if there are any additional edits from there.

Agenda Item 6 – Miscellaneous Issues –

- Ms. Ortiz opened to the proposed verbiage for Section 15.5 for Fire Mesh changes that the members were to come back with feedback. Ms. Black stated she did get feedback from Ms. LaFrenais that she forwarded to Ms. Mitwasi. Ms. Black stated that the verbiage from Bear Valley was agreeing that anything over a three-inch tear needed to have an action item against it and anything under three inches, a fire would self-seal it. Ms. Mitwasi stated that she forwarded the document to SCE's fire mesh team for a review. Ms. LaFrenais stated that was a criterion sent to her by Bear Valley's head foreman that she forwarded to Ms. Black. Ms. Black stated she put in verbiage for how anybody out in the field would send it back to Bear Valley as an action item. She stated it is basically a third-party notification which is what she referred to it as. Ms. Ortiz stated that they will continue to discuss this next month and review the feedback from SCE's fire mesh team.
- Ms. Ortiz opened to adding the definition of Free Attachment to the Routine Handbook. Mr. Bacon stated he sent something out last month. He stated he could only think of two reasons or situations where they would put in a Free Attachment. The first would be an interset pole if they are setting a pole and it benefits the member that is setting the pole, but does not benefit the other members, then it should be a Free Attachment. The other scenario is the service route. If the service route is going to service, the residents that they are going to feed and there is a pole that could be attached to in route to the service point that would be to hold it up over the road or getting it over the alleys to get the service point. He stated he would like the members to review and add their input. Ms. Black stated that she got confused by this and sent it to a couple of engineers who wanted to redline it. Ms. Black stated that the NCJPA has a definition for Free Attachment in their handbook and asked Mr. Bacon if she would like it. She stated she believes a Free Attachment is only

eligible if crossing the street of a lead, so it is rare that they qualify for a Free Attachment. Mr. Bacon stated that the biggest scenario he has seen is in an alley where they have the main pole line on one side of the alley and then they are going across the alley to go feed the residents. He stated in the path there is a communication pole on the other side, or it may be a power pole, but typically it is a communication pole that has three or four feet above the communication with room to attach. He stated the only reason they are attaching to this pole is to serve their customer. Ms. Black stated she would send the NCJPA definition for Free Attachment for Mr. Bacon to review. Mr. Carrion stated he had a question he would like to get Mr. Bacon's intake on. He asked if a company wants to place an antenna on a pole that has no power facilities on it and they want to bring power to that pole to service their small cell site, would that also qualify as a Free Attachment for power. Mr. Bacon stated that it is, but the difference would be for LADWP to have a service attachment on top they will need to have GO 95 clearance which is six feet which they will not be able to attain unless they change out the pole, but then they are going to be an owner anyways. He stated for GO 95 it really does not work. He stated that if LADWP only has four feet above it limits them and that this is more advantageous to the communication companies. If they have a pole on the other side on the service route and they attach it with a J hook, or chicken catchers (wire attachments that go onto the J hook). He stated that is the purpose of the Free Attachment, they do not really need to be attached to that pole. He further stated that this is not a line feed. A line feed is different than a service feed. He stated as far as attaching an antenna and running a Free Attachment to the pole to service it, they would never get GO 95 off of that. Mr. Van Stryk stated that trying to do power as a Free Attachment might mess with inspection or replacement. Mr. Bacon stated that they will do it from time to time if they are serving a pole for a base owner, they will get a Free Attachment if it is just a service point. Ms. Black asked the members to review the definition, from the NCJPA Handbook, she sent via chat, "Free attachments are specific to paralleling Member's leads with service conductors crossing thoroughfares directly to a premise served. Free attachment requirements are detailed in Section 11.0 and depicted in Examples A through F on Page 11-3. r16." Mr. Van Stryk asked if a Free Attachment still requires a Preliminary Form 2. The members agreed it did. Mr. Bacon stated that the definition Ms. Black sent brings up for service points in route for service path and does not recognize the other scenario that applies for an interset pole. He stated that other than those two scenarios he could not think of any other Free Attachments

that would apply in the SCJPC. Ms. Black asked to view page 11-2 and stated that on this page she did not see anything on an interest pole. Mr. Bacon asked to view Section 9 and the definition of an interest pole. Mr. Bacon stated that if they are setting an interest pole and it only benefits the member who is setting that pole, he stated he always understood it as a Free Attachment. Ms. Black stated it is a Clearance Attachment. Mr. Bacon stated that if they have a 150-foot space but need to lateral off to feed another business they will be putting that pole in the middle of the span, but it does not benefit the communication companies, it only benefits LADWP. He stated that all the other communications get a Free Attachment. Ms. Black stated that a Clearance Attachment is on an interest pole and a Free Attachment is because of a lead on the other side of the street. Ms. Black stated that the difference is when an interest pole gets replaced 25-30 years later it becomes a joint pole where members on that pole share in the cost of that full replacement, whereas on a Free Attachment they do not become an owner they still have the Free Attachment. Ms. Black stated that because they have different names, they would not want to include the definition of an interest pole in the definition of Free Attachment. Mr. Bacon agreed. Mr. Bacon stated that he likes the wording Ms. Black sent and asked Ms. Black to send the text to him. Mr. Bacon stated he will take it back to modify and add some of the language from what Ms. Black sent.

- Ms. Ortiz opened to Nonconformance/Form 11 for Ms. Mitwasi. Ms. Mitwasi asked for this item to be tabled for next month.
- Ms. Ortiz opened to Steel Stubbing from Mr. Armstrong. He was not on the call, and this was tabled for the next month's Routine Revision meeting.
- Ms. Ortiz opened to Construction Correction Process from Mr. Harmon. He was not on the call, and this was tabled for the next month's Routine Revision meeting.

Agenda Item 9 – Review of Action items/JPA Alerts –

- Ms. Black will meet with SCE offline to discuss the GPS Coordinates revision.
- Ms. Mitwasi will send her edits regarding Engineered Steel Poles revision. Ms. Black will reach out to Mr. Harmon.
- The proposed verbiage for Fire Mesh will be sent to the membership for review and are to come back with any feedback next month.
- Mr. Bacon will revise the definition for Free Attachment.
- Ms. Mitwasi will work on revising the Form 11.

- Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Harmon required to discuss last two Miscellaneous bullets.

The Meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m. until August 17, 2022.

Anali Spencer – Committee Staff

**FORM 7 - JOINT POLE MEMORANDUM
PULL FINAL BILL FROM BILL CYCLE
EXAMPLE xx**

(1) Protest Form 7's, are discussed in Section 18. Specifics are found in 18.1-B (2) (c), (d) & (e).

be removed from. The reason to stop billing must be included.

(2) For this transaction, the SCJPC Office must be listed under Carbon Copy TO:

(4) U1 and U2 should work together to resolve the issue. When resolved, U1 would resend the F7 with a "Resolved - OK TO BILL, and date" on it and email it to SCJPC Office.

(3) Requesting member (U1) should list the JPA No and list the Bill Cycle the final bill is to

Utility	Representative/Signature	Phone No.	J/P MEMORANDUM FORM 7 Used for additions, deletions or changes to Authorizations (See Section 18.1C)	Date: 1/3/2022
To: U2				JPA No: U2-123456
To:				Job No:
To:				
From: U1				
Dist./Exc.: 2				
Carbon Copies To: SCJPC Office			☐ SEE JPA PRELIMINARY ATTACHED	
☐ ADD	☐ CORRECT TO READ	☐ CHANGE LOCATION TO READ		
☐ DELETE	☐ CANCEL JPA	☐ REMOVE TEMPORARY ATTACHMENT FROM RECORD		
Remarks: 3				
Please remove Final Bill U2-123456 from billing cycle 1-22-U234, because U1 Form 2 changes are not entered on the FB.				

After U1 and U2 work the issue out: Resend the same Form 7, stating OK to bill. See (4).

Utility	Representative/Signature	Phone No.	J/P MEMORANDUM FORM 7 Used for additions, deletions or changes to Authorizations (See Section 18.1C)	Date: 1/3/2022
To: U2				JPA No: U2-123456
To:				Job No:
To:				
From: U1				
Dist./Exc.: 2				
Carbon Copies To: SCJPC Office			☐ SEE JPA PRELIMINARY ATTACHED	
☐ ADD	☐ CORRECT TO READ	☐ CHANGE LOCATION TO READ		
☐ DELETE	☐ CANCEL JPA	☐ REMOVE TEMPORARY ATTACHMENT FROM RECORD		
Remarks: 3				
Please remove Final Bill U2-123456 from billing cycle 1-22-U234, because U1 Form 2 changes are not entered on the FB.				
Resolved 3-30-22. OK for U2 to Final Bill.				
			4	

FINAL FORM 2 JOINT POLE AUTHORIZATION EXAMPLE 35

(1) JPAs are required to final bill in 'Date Sent' order. If there is a pending JPA(s), the RECORD information on a JPA is to reflect the PROPOSED pole information from the pending JPA to final bill first. If there are no pending JPAs, the RECORD information must match the SCJPC pole record.

Note: A FINAL JPA is not to be sent to the SCJPC until all pending JPAs (if applicable) have been final billed.

(2) Transfer all data from the Preliminary JPA to the Final JPA.

- a. APPROVED column should have the approval name or 18.1D.
- b. Type one item (Item No. or Authorized Costs) per line.

(3) Leave the Date Completed section empty.
The SCJPC office will enter this date.

(4) Enter the Form 48 date sent.

[illegible]

PRELIMINARY JOINT POLE AUTHORIZATION ADDING GPS COORDINATES TO POLE LOCATIONS EXAMPLE xx

(1) This transaction shows how to add GPS coordinates for a pole location.

Use WGS84 formatting, with 6 to 8 digits, and place under the Section 15.4 pole location address. (8 digits is most accurate.)

(2) When the pole is replaced, it will move one foot on the address line, but using the same GPS coordinates is ok.

NOTE: Adding GPS coordinates are optional, but are highly recommended.

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT POLE TRANSACTION															J.P. FORM 2-1 Preliminary 1/95
Date Prepared		This authorization is in accordance with Joint Pole Agreement and Routine. The undersigned have agreed on joint work as specified hereon.													
Date Sent		Confirming Agreement		In Field ☐		By Telephone ☐		Est. Const. Start		No. of Pages		J.P. Auth. No.			
4/14/2014				☐		☐				1		U3-123-456			

UTILITY	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT-DIVISION-EXCHANGE	APPROVED	TAXING INSTRUCTIONS	ACCOUNTING DATA
U1	JONES	LOS ANGELES	JONES	LOS ANGELES	5577303
U2	JOHNSON	LOS ANGELES	JOHNSON	LOS ANGELES	A403
U3	SMITH	LOS ANGELES	SMITH	LOS ANGELES	12345

POLE NO.	Pole Length Anchor Size	Year Set	Pole Id. 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			U1	U2	U3				
				L				L					U1 TO REPLACE POLE FOR BENEFIT OF U3 SEC 7.3, 10.8	1
1234U1	45	02	FT	38-9	24-8			PTD					DREAM RD S/S 212' W/O ONE WAY	2
			CL-3										33.881958, -118.274545	1
								1	1			83	U3 TO PAY U1 & U2 FOR TRANSFER	4
														5
5678U1	50	14	FT					43-13	23-5	24-1			DREAM RD S/S 211' W/O ONE WAY	6
													33.881958, -118.274545	2
														7
														8
														9
														10
														11
														12
														13

POLE LEGEND: L = LOWER TOP (Item SE)
 P = PULL (Item 5A) C(PX) = 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

NEVERLAND COMMUNITY

VPJ.P.-03
 Rev. Jul 2013

Date **ITEM 1783**

Prepared 4/14/2014

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT POLE TRANSACTION

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

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

Date
Sent 4/16/2014Confirming
AgreementIn
Field ☐By
Telephone ☐Est.
Const.
StartNo. of
Pages 1J.P.
Auth.No. U3-123-456

UTILITY	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT-DIVISION-EXCHANGE	APPROVED	TAXING INSTRUCTIONS	ACCOUNTING DATA
U1	JONES	LOS ANGELES	JONES	LOS ANGELES	5577303
U2	JOHNSON	LOS ANGELES	JOHNSON	LOS ANGELES	A403
U3	SMITH	LOS ANGELES	SMITH	LOS ANGELES	12345

POLE NO.	Pole Length Anchor Size	Year Set	Pole Trt	Record				Proposed					Item No.	LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK If not in accordance with Joint Pole agreement and routine-state reasons.
			Class											
			Anchor Direct.	U1	U2			U1	U2	U3				
				L				L						U1 TO REPLACE POLE FOR BENEFIT OF U3 SEC 7.3, 10.8 1
1234U1	45	02	FT	39-9	24-6			PTD						DREAM RD S/S 212' W/O ONE WAY 2
			CL-3											33.881958, -118.274545 1 3
								1	1				83	U3 TO PAY U1 & U2 FOR TRANSFER 4
														5
5678U1	50	14	FT					43-13	23-5	24-1				DREAM RD S/S 211' W/O ONE WAY 6
														33.881958, -118.274545 2 7
														8
														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

NEVERLAND
COMMUNITY

VP/J.P.-03

Rev. Jul 2013

New section.

15.4- B GPS Coordinates

The GPS Coordinates, when known, can be listed under the 15.4 Pole Location Address on the LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK side of the Form 2. The coordinates should be 6 to 8 digits (8 being most accurate) and be formatted to WGS84 standard. Adding the GPS coordinates is optional but highly recommended when the existing pole record does not list it. See Example xx in Section 18, page 18-xx.

Under Section 18.1 A – add red below

RECORD FORMS

18.0 Record Forms

The forms used for expediting joint pole work and recording transactions are listed below:

Form #	Form Name
2-1	Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization
2-2	Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization
2-1 FINAL	Final Joint Pole Authorization
2-2 FINAL	Final Joint Pole Authorization
Form 7	Joint Pole Memorandum
Form 9	Joint Pole Riser Notification
Form 11	Notice of GO 95 Non-Conformance
Form 12	Pole Record
Form 16	Reallocation of Space
Form 44	Bill of Sale
Form 48	Notice of Work Completed
Form 49	Tracer

Hard or soft copies shall be provided as agreed by the parties.

(Revised January 2015)

18.1 Form 2 - Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization

Any agreement to undertake joint work must be confirmed in writing by using this form. This is authority to undertake joint work as specified. Member initiating transaction shall make necessary copies for each Member involved, all of which must be approved by an authorized representative of each involved Member. Approval may be by signature of the authorized representative to be shown on the forms in the space provided, or by the authorized representative's name, followed by the written initials of a delegated representative confirming the agreement. Names of representatives effecting agreement must be specified in space provided. Members that have various designated District, Division, or Exchange areas should identify the appropriate area by name. The Joint Pole Authorization number is assigned by the issuing Member. The Joint Pole Authorization number should begin with the Initiator's Member code and can have a maximum of 23 alpha or numeric characters only. The only exceptions are blank spaces or hyphens within the 23 maximum character count. If the Form 2 is revised, characters like RO1 or COR are not included in the maximum 23-character count for the F2 name (Revised March 2021).

18.1-A Preparation of Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization

By agreement, any Member may be designated as the constructing Member in joint work.

The Member initiating Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization shall specify its Authorization number and all required details of the agreement. The Joint Pole Authorization number shall begin with the current member's code. The Form 2 shall include, but is not limited to:

- (a) Pole Number
- (b) Nature of work
- (c) Applicable Routine Section Number
- (d) Designation of involved Members
- (e) Circuits
- (f) Interest
- (g) Grade
- (h) Space
- (i) Pole/equipment data, including jointly owned arms, anchors, risers, wireless and broadband equipment.
- (j) Other essential record data i.e. tenants, power communication (P.Comm)
- (k) Authorized Costs item number and number of items where required
- (l) Police and/or fire report or case number when applicable and available
- (m) Provide billing information when applicable billing sections are used
- (n) Estimated construction start date
- (o) Date sent
- (p) Date prepared
- (q) Pole Class for wood poles
- (r) Additional notes such as pending JPA numbers or corrections per field conditions
- (s) Pole loading analysis only for poles associated with the JPA. NOTE: (1) Members cannot dictate pole loading method and format however must meet all GO95 requirements (2) Section 4.1 refer to the section.
- (t) Optional drawing/map: highlight only the poles associated with the JPA (Revised June 2020).
- (u) GPS coordinates. (Optional)

The Preliminary Form 2 shall be limited to 10 pages.

Where a specific transaction involves special agreement, it shall be designated as such on Joint Pole Authorization. (See Section 1.2)

It is the responsibility of all Members involved in the Joint Pole Authorization to see that data and details of the agreement are correct. The date Joint Pole Authorization is sent shall be used in completing the billing for structural and salvage values; except in replacements, the date poles are set shall apply.

Any deviation shall be by agreement of the Members involved and noted on the Joint Pole

FORM 50

GPS Coordinates Addition/Correction

Utility Representative Phone No. or E-Mail

To: _____ Date: _____

From: _____

No.	SCJPC Unique ID	Pole Number	Existing Latitude	New/Updated Latitude	Existing Longitude	New/Updated Longitude
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						

Approved Date: _____	Denial Date: _____
Approved By: _____	Denied By: _____
Date Sent to SCJPC: _____	Reason for Denial: _____ _____ _____

18.11 Form 50 – GPS Coordinates Addition/Correction

This form is used to notify the base owner of the addition/correction of a joint pole's GPS coordinates.

This form is not to be used for a pole pending on a JPA as the addition/correction is to be addressed on the pending JPA.

The form shall be sent to the base owner for review. If base owner approves the proposed GPS coordinates, the approved form will be returned to the sender and to the SCJPC for pole record update. If the base owner denies the proposed GPS coordinates, a reason will be provided, and form is to be returned to sender.

Response is to be received from base owner within 45 days.

See Example XX, page 18-XX.

FORM 50 – GPS COORDINATES ADDITION/CORRECTION EXAMPLE XX

- (1) This form shows a member notifying the pole's base owner of the addition/correction of a joint pole's GPS coordinates.
- (2) All poles listed on form need to be for the same base owner.
- (3) The first entry shows the proposed addition of GPS coordinates (WGS84).
- (4) The second entry shows the proposed correction of GPS coordinates (WGS84).
- (5) If the base owner approves the proposed GPS coordinates, this section is to be completed.
- (6) If the base owner denies the proposed GPS coordinates, this section is to be completed.

FORM 50 GPS Coordinates Addition/Correction

	Utility	Representative	Phone No. or E-Mail	
To:	U1	JONES	888-888-8888	Date: 6/2/2022
From:	U2	JOHNSON	888-888-8888	

No.	SCJPC Unique ID	Pole Number	Existing Latitude	New/Updated Latitude	Existing Longitude	New/Updated Longitude
3 → 1	354846	84354U1	N/A	33.515748	N/A	-117.384365
4 → 2	138745	96412U1	34.659587	34.559587	-118.684698	-118.548695
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						

5 → Approved Date: 6/14/2022

5 → Approved By: JONES

5 → Date Sent to SCJPC: 6/14/2022

6 → Denial Date: _____

6 → Denied By: _____

6 → Reason for Denial: _____

Engineered Steel RH verbiage changes

3.14 Notice of Intention to Construct Other than Wood Pole.

If constructing Member, to accommodate other members' requirements, is involved in expense exceeding that required for its facilities when alone, purchase of interest by Member desiring to participate in joint ownership shall be made when poles and anchors have been installed according to approved plan.

Section 1.2 required for Engineered Steel Poles (Revised January 2008). (See loading requirement notes in Section 15.4, for ES-1 and ES-2 poles.)

7.3 Overbuild

This section provides for the replacement of a solely owned or a jointly owned pole, less than 25 years old for the sole benefit of an incoming Member or one joint owner. This section also applies to poles replaced due to damage caused by facilities of a joint owner, poles replaced due to California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) mandates directed at specific member facilities, and to all solely owned or jointly owned poles replaced for the sole benefit of Members

having less than 20 consecutive years of Joint Pole Committee membership.

The cost to benefiting Member shall include:

- (a) Equity of overbuilt Member's structural value of existing pole, less salvage
- (b) Cost of transfer
- (c) Additional material installed to comply with requirements of joint ownership
- (d) Sidewalk or pavement repairs
- (e) Entire removal cost

The sole owner, or each joint owner as appropriate, shall bill the benefiting Member for the portion of pulling and transportation it performs. The Member recovering pole shall allow salvage to other owner(s) for its relinquished interest. Member placing new pole shall bill an interest to other Members.

When a benefiting Member replaces pole and another Member desires additional grade or space, replacement shall be made in accordance with rule of the Routine relating to Section 7.11. Mutual benefit shall not apply where a non-benefiting owner is forced to increase grade or space as a result of the activities undertaken by the benefiting Member.

7.14 Replacement of Wood Pole with Other than Wood Pole.

Member replacing wood pole with other than wood pole for mutual benefit, shall sell interest in new pole to other Members concerned. Each member shall transfer at own expense, receive salvage, and pay pulling and transportation. Mutual benefit shall be understood to apply under this section as follows:

- (a) Pole 25 years old or more

ITEM 1784 ENGINEERED STEEL POLES

- (b) Pole less than 25 years old, but rendered unfit for service by any cause not the fault of a joint owner including existing overloaded poles. (Revised April 2015)
- (c) Pole requiring relocation for the benefit of all Members concerned
- (d) Pole identified in authorized maintenance inspection program as unfit for service
- (e) Pole requiring replacement for clearing of discovered existing General Order 95 infractions not the fault of any joint owner.
- (f) Pole replaced prior to Form 2 and Form 48. Form 2 must be noted that this is a Priority Pole. Section 7.13 applies only if Form 2 is not issued within 45 days. (Revised February 2017)
- (g) Pole replacements initiated to fulfill CPUC mandated requirements directed to Members with specific facilities, shall be Section 7.3.

For poles that are more than 25 years old, this section applies only to Members having more than 20 consecutive years of Joint Pole Committee membership.

For those Members with less than 20 consecutive years of Joint Pole Committee membership, which initiates the replacement of poles under the provisions of (a) above, Section 7.3 shall apply.

This rule shall also apply where owner failed to issue Notice of Intention for pole and incoming Member desires its replacement within three years, beginning with January 1 following date of its installation. If pole has been installed longer than the three-year period specified and is not more than 25 years old, the replacement shall be in accordance with rule of the Routine relating to Section 7.3.

Section 1.2 required for Engineered Steel Poles. (See loading requirement notes in Section 15.4, for ES-1 and ES-2 poles.)

Note: The setting member will PTD other than wood poles.
(Revised January 2011).

15.5 Alternative To Wood Poles

CF (Composite Fiberglass – single piece)

CM (Composite Fiberglass – multi pieces)

LS (Lightweight Steel)

HS (Heavy Steel)

CP (Concrete Pole)

DI (Ductile Iron)

HD (Heavy Ductile Iron)

ES-1 (Engineered Steel – Additional load can be added per GO 95 Rule 44.3, see note below regarding “reserve load” being required.) **Member claiming a “NO more additional load” as reason for denial of access shall provide denied member a written rejection of their attachment request with proof that this additional load shall lower the Safety Factor to below the GO 95 minimums.

ES-2 (Engineered Steel – Ok to add additional load.)

Notation: Engineered Steel poles require Section 1.2. Any Member setting an ES-1 Engineered Steel pole as a replacement to a Wood pole must incur all cost above and beyond the cost to install a wood pole that would have met the 4.0 safety factor. New ES-1 Pole setting member can share cost above and beyond a 4.0 SF wood pole if that member can show a CPUC authority allowing such action. These costs can also be shared thru mutual agreement and a Section 1.2. New ES-1 Pole setting member must send all other occupying members a final set of Loading Calculations that contain values that show a minimum 1.5 Safety Factor on the steel structure, a

ITEM 1784 ENGINEERED STEEL POLES

2.0 Safety Factor for overturn-*Lateral Bearing* and a 1.5 Safety Factor when calculating uplift. Soil inspection reports and tested values shall also be provided upon demand as a part of any GO 95 Rule 44.4 request. The Safety factors derived from final loads (Kips, KSF) shall be stamped by a Civil PE. Any Form 2 initiating an ES-1 pole (either solely or joint) after xxxx, 202x that does not add in this reserve load, the base owner will need to replace the ES-1 pole as a 7.3 upon a new Member applying for ownership.

(Revised January 2008). (LS & CP revised June 2008). (DI, CM added January 2011). (HS,HD added October 2013).

Fire Mesh verbiage changes

15.5 Length, Year Set and Treatment of Pole

The length, year set and treatment of pole must be accurately given on Joint Pole Authorization as these data constitute the basis upon which price is fixed for interest in pole in accordance with schedules of structural values. For purposes of type of treatment, they shall be listed on the Joint Pole Authorization as Butt Treated (T), Full Treated (FT), Gray (G) or Additional Treatment (AT).

Types of treatment included in these groupings are as follows. **These category grouping types are required information on a preliminary Form 2:**

T (Butt Treated)

Creosote or Pentachlorophenol

FT (Full Treated) Creosote Pentachlorophenol Cellon - Natural

ColorChemonite

Copper Naphthenate **(No Fire Mesh Wrap added.)**

FTW (Full Treated with Fire Mesh Wrap added)

G (Gray)

Gray Stained - Cellon Gray Stained - Chemonite

Gray Stained - Butt Treated Cedar

AT Methylisothiocyanate-MITC FUME or WoodFume

UltraFume

Disodium octaborate teraglydrate-Tim-borFluorod

Disodium octaborate-Boron rods

15.5-A Additional Treatment of Joint Poles

Mutual agreement must be obtained prior to additional treatment of existing joint poles. The actual Chemical used for additional treatment will be identified on the preliminary joint pole authorization.

Fire Mesh Wrap is specifically designed to withstand wildfires by adding a protective layer, as an additional treatment on the pole. When a Base Owner decides it is necessary, Fire Mesh Wrap can be placed on poles in High Fire Threat District areas. These wrapped poles will have FTW treatment category groupings listed on the preliminary joint pole authorization. **NOTE: Poles with this wrap can be climbed with gaffs or can have pole steps placed on it after the wrap is installed. Prod, Intrusive and Sound testing of the pole is not hampered by the wrap. Any small tears measuring XXXXX done to the wrap, do not need to be repaired. Any tear larger than XXXX is something the base owner would like to repair. The base owners who place this wrap request to be notified of tears larger than XXXXX, via the contact email listed under "Pole Inspection Contacts and Resources" on the spreadsheet labeled "SCJPC Pole Inspection Contacts", on the SCJPC website. For additional information regarding Fire Wrap, please see the Q&A document regarding Fire Wrap under "Pole Inspection Contacts and Resources" under SCE Fire Mesh Wrap Q&A document, on the SCJPC website.**

MISC: FIRE MESH

Do we need something in the glossary?

MISC: FREE ATTACHMENT DEFINITION

Free Attachments

Free attachment is defined as allowing another member to attach to an existing pole at no charge

Free Attachments apply to the following conditions;

To be used for service attachment as a direct path to a point of attachment that will serve their customer and when the Free attachment pole allows for service clearance for all GO.95 requirements. Multiple poles in close proximity the incoming member will pay to attach to the first pole attachment and the successive attachment shall be free (three pole rack)

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 599-3801

August 17, 2022

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, **at 11:07 a.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:**

Ms. Maria Ortiz	XO Communications
Ms. Alicia Walsh	Southern California Edison
Ms. April DeBarge	Southern California Edison
Ms. Camile Bowie	Southern California Edison
Ms. Valerie Mitwasi	Southern California Edison
Mr. Glenn Leckie	Frontier Communications
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Mr. Earle Carrion	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Megan LaMon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Jeremy Harmon	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Katy White	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time Warner Cable
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel Corporation/Sprint Communications CO.L. P
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Barry Consulter	AT&T California
Mr. Troy Stanard	AT&T California
Mr. Todd Dailey	AT&T California
Ms. Veronica Romero	AT&T California
Ms. Joy Young	AT&T California
Mr. Alvin Robielos	AT&T California
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Richard Soriano	City of Banning
Ms. Yvonne Johnson	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Nicholas Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Ms. Amanda Lindgren	City of Glendale
Ms. Linda McLean	Extenet Systems
Ms. Heidi Seropian	Extenet Systems
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Services Inc.
Ms. Claudia Arellano	City of Vernon
Mr. Renzo Garzon	Mobilitie, LLC
Ms. Patti Ringo	Sonic Telecom, LLC
Mr. Anthony Ghilardi	City of Pasadena
Ms. Ashley Romero	City of Pasadena
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff

Ms. Kathleen Allen
Ms. Anali Spencer

Committee Staff
Committee Staff

Ms. Ortiz called the meeting to order at 11:07 a.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Review of prior month’s minutes - Ms. Ortiz opened the meeting by inquiring if there were any questions or concerns regarding the previous meeting minutes. There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 2 – Interpretation of Routine Handbook – Ms. Ortiz opened the discussion to the members for any questions regarding the Routine Handbook. There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 3 – Item 1597: Review of Routine Handbook Examples (5/19/2015) – Ms. Ortiz reopened the discussion on Review of Routine Handbook Examples. She stated that Pull from Billing and Example 35 were reviewed and approved today at the Administrative Board and could be removed.

Ms. Ortiz asked if there were any new examples that any members would like to review or discuss. There were no further comments or concerns at this time.

Agenda Item 4 - Item 1783: Lat and Long on the Form 2 (from Administrative Board – 2/16/2022). – Ms. Ortiz opened to lat./long. on the Form 2. Ms. Black stated that Ms. Pranata sent out the latest revisions on Monday but Mr. Bacon, who was no longer on the call, had mentioned that LADWP had a question. Ms. Black stated they will have to wait for Mr. Bacon to discuss and that she would ask him to send his question via email to have it for the next meeting. Ms. Ortiz stated that this item will be tabled for the next meeting.

Agenda Item 5 - Item 1784: Engineered Steel Poles (from Administrative Board – 2/16/2022). - Ms. Ortiz opened to Engineered Steel Poles. Ms. Black stated that there was a revision to this and asked Ms. Pranata to open up the emailed revision. Ms. Black stated that AT&T California met with SCE. Ms. Mitwasi submitted her edits and Mr. Harmon also put in his edits. She stated the current version was a combination from all the companies edits which she believes everyone was agreeing on because she did not get an email back stating otherwise. Ms. Pranata displayed the updated Engineered Steel Pole verbiage (see attached). Ms. Black stated that the intention of the edit was to get more specifics around Engineered Steel Poles. She stated she original started this because it was not originally clear to her that Engineered Steel Poles had an additional load inherently built into them or maybe in the beginning when they got engineered, they did not and now they do. Ms. Black stated she was trying to create two different types of Engineered Steel Poles one that would not have an additional load and one that did. Working together with Ms. Mitwasi and Mr.

Harmon, Ms. Black was informed that there is a CPUC mandate that requires there be an additional load, she stated because of this there is now verbiage for one type of Engineered Steel Pole because they do have additional loading within it. She stated that the verbiage in red was what the proposed verbiage edits are. Ms. Black stated that under Section 7.14 Ms. Mitwasi added that the pole would become a Section 7.3 when applicable and she asked her what “when applicable” meant. Ms. Mitwasi stated she did not have an update on this and was waiting for a response from her SCE team. Ms. Black stated that AT&T California would not want to move forward with this verbiage until they understand what “when applicable” means and define it in the Routine Handbook. Ms. Black asked if any of the members had any questions before moving further. Ms. Black stated that in Section 15.7 (Alternative To Wood Poles) is where all the technical verbiage was which Mr. Harmon could assist in explaining if members have any questions or edits. Ms. LaFrenais asked about on the location and nature of work, if they had an Engineered Steel Pole would they reference both Section 15.7 (Alternative To Wood Poles) and Section 1.2. Ms. Black stated that on the Form 2 under the treatment section they would have ES for the Engineered Steel Pole. In discussing this Ms. Black realized that they will no longer require the dash one or dash two after the ES and stated she would edit that. Ms. Black stated that when members see ES, they will know it is an Engineered Steel Pole. She stated Engineered Steel Poles require a Section 1.2 in the Location and Nature of Work and it cannot be an 18.1 approval, it would need to be agreed upon with the other utilities on the pole. Ms. LaFrenais added that a bracket for heavy ductile and engineering steel be added. Mr. Treepaisan stated that the verbiage looked good and he like the direction the statements in red are going. Ms. Black asked the members if a definition of an Engineered Steel Pole into the glossary. She stated that was a question that had been asked but nothing she had not generated anything. Mr. Harmon stated it would be reasonable, but they would want the definition to be broad being that there is new technologies and various types of Engineered Steel Poles. He stated that they are predominantly identifying that the pole itself is designed to resolve the majority of the load and not guyed as is predominately used. He stated it would be valuable to put that basic definition so that the parties reading can understand why they do not see guy wires. Ms. Ortiz asked if they would also need to add definitions for the other types of poles. Ms. Black stated that would be a good idea because she has had those questions addressed to her. Ms. Black stated she could work on basic definitions and possibly send it to Mr. Harmon after to add to it. Mr. Harmon stated that would be fine and he could then send it to Mr. Stonerock for the final touches.

Agenda Item 6 – Miscellaneous Issues –

- **Fire Mesh verbiage Sec 15.5** - Ms. Ortiz opened to the proposed verbiage for Section 15.5 for Fire Mesh changes that the members were to come back with feedback. Ms. Black stated she did get

feedback from both SCE and Bear Valley Electric which are the members that place Fire Mesh in the field (see attached). Mr. Treepaisan stated he ran this by his JPA team at Frontier and they were okay with the changes as well. Ms. Black stated that there was a gentleman on Ms. Mitwasi's team that added a lot of the changes under "AT" in which she was able to learn a lot. She asked if the members were ok with moving this to Discussion. There were no objections. Ms. Ortiz stated this will be in the Discussion calendar at the Administrative Board for next month.

- **Adding the definition of Free Attachment** - Ms. Ortiz opened to adding the definition of Free Attachment to the Routine Handbook. Ms. Black stated she forwarded what was from the NCJPA Handbook and that she updated the page number to the SCJPC Routine Handbook page numbers. Ms. Black stated that this was not yet sent to the membership and gave the members a moment to review. She stated Mr. Bacon agreed that this was in lieu of what was currently in the packet which he had submitted. The members agreed that this was clear and concise. Ms. Smith stated that under Section 9.4 it does not state for the member with the Clear Attachment on a pole replacement becomes an owner. Ms. Black stated that in parentheses she did add a Free Attachment remains free when the pole is replaced and asked Ms. Allen if this was correct. Mr. Van Stryk inquired if they were talking about Free Attachment or Clear Attachment. Ms. Smith asked to pull up Section 9.4 to review. Ms. Black stated when an interset pole is replaced it becomes a joint pole and with a Free Attachment is when they have a lead on one side and they are communication and the power company has a lead on the other side of the street and they need to serve a customer on the power side of the street, it becomes a free attachment and remains a free attachment when the pole in the power lead becomes replaced. Ms. Black to Mr. Van Stryk that to answer his question a Free Attachment is different from a Clearance Attachment. Mr. Harmon asked if the Clearance Attachment member is charged. Ms. Black stated when they place an interset pole and put a member on as a Clearance Attachment they are not and asked Ms. Allen if this was correct. Ms. Ortiz stated that she thinks Ms. Smith was right that when a pole is replaced, they remain as a Clearance Attachment on the new pole. Ms. Allen stated she has seen it both ways where it is Clear to Clear or Clear to Joint. Ms. Allen stated that if there is a Section 9.4 it is Clear to Clear and if there is a Section 9.4 plus a Section 7.X then they know it is a Clear to Joint pole. She stated besides this she could only explain the billing aspect. Ms. Ortiz stated that maybe they would need to clarify Section 9.4. Mr. Harmon stated that a

Clearance Attachment and Section 9.1 and Section 9.4 clearly identified that a party has interest in trying to come in or create a clearance to get on a pole adjacent to that pole, whereas a Free Attachment is something he has seen used when there is power on one side and a communication on the other and they use each other's poles for delivering services. Ms. Ortiz stated that for the member with the Clearance attachment, they did not have a need for the interset pole to be there to begin with and if the pole needs to be replaced it is still on the setting member. The member with the Clearance Attachment still does not need that pole. Mr. Van Stryk stated that with a Free Attachment they would. Ms. Ortiz stated that Section 9.4 should be revised so it can be clearer. She returned to the Free Attachment definition and asked the members if there were any objections. Mr. Van Stryk stated that the word "paralleling" was confusing to him. Ms. Black stated that on page 11-2 the verbiage would help Mr. Van Stryk and asked Ms. Pranata to open up page 11-2. Ms. Black asked if the members would also want to include within the parentheses another sentence that stating, "not to be confused with a clearance attachment." Mr. Van Stryk asked if they were going to require purchase for the Free Attachment if the pole is replaced. Mr. Harmon stated that the party setting the pole is benefiting or from the Free Attachment and from the carrier's perspective they would like to give Free attachments if they could get service drops aerially and more efficiently. He stated they do not want their power friends to have to purchase the pole space, and if for whatever reason they had to replace the pole a free attachment should stay free. He stated if any power company has the need to expand on the pole, then they have the opportunity to purchase more feet and that he would want to preserve the ability to translate the Free Attachment to the new pole. Mr. Van Stryk stated that the example on page 11-2 line D mentions for like purposes purchase required. Ms. Black stated that the only thing that qualifies for a Free Attachment is a service drop not if it is a cable. Mr. Van Stryk asked what if they use a service drop 10 spans, would that still be a service drop. Ms. Black stated that is not used as a service drop 10 spans. Mr. Van Stryk explained a single pair fiber to be run on a J hook. It doesn't necessarily mean one span to a weather head. Mr. Harmon agreed this was legitimate and they should put a limitation on that. Mr. Van Stryk stated at what point is it no longer considered a service job the SCJPC Routine Handbook's standpoint. Mr. Harmon stated that a lot of this comes out of GO 95. He stated that with new technologies that could be a "service type drop" and then runs to numerous poles. Mr. Harmon agreed that a service drop from the power side is clearly defined and former communication systems,

but for new systems it would be legitimate to put some guidelines on how many service drops could be made and be subject to the party allowing the approval where they could deny if it exceeds the number of poles in a row. Mr. Treepaisan stated the way the rules are written when they attach a messenger or guy that requires purchase it is no longer like a service drop. He stated he thought it was one space that they attached to a pole and have it go to the weather head or building. Ms. Black stated that she could take back all these comments and add that to the definition saying it goes one space and that the service drop does not have a messenger. Mr. Van Stryk stated that would help. Ms. Black stated this will be left in ad hoc and she will add the revisions and verbiage and send it to Ms. Pranata to forward to the members. Towards the end of the meeting, Ms. Ortiz stated she will work on revising the Section 9.4 and bring it back next month.

- **Nonconformance/Form 11** - Ms. Ortiz opened to Nonconformance/Form 11 for Ms. Mitwasi. Ms. Mitwasi stated she had a chance to revise the Form and that she sent it to SCE's asset data team because she would like to put together a sample of how the data from the Form can be used for reporting purposes. She stated that by next month she will be able to have both the sample reporting and the updated form for review. Ms. Mitwasi asked for this item to be tabled for next month.
- **Steel Stubbing** - Ms. Ortiz opened to Steel Stubbing from Mr. Armstrong. Mr. Armstrong would not be able to attend the meetings for some time and she stated what he was questioning was why members were being charged for steel stubbing when the base owner was going to turn around and replace the pole. She stated she was unsure if this was something they would like to discuss now or wait until Mr. Armstrong's return. She asked if any members had anything to share on steel stubbing. Mr. Van Stryk stated that he believes it is a temporary safety measure to elongate the life of the pole while they are working on planning and getting resources out to do the replacement or outage. Ms. Ortiz stated Mr. Armstrong was also asking if the member gets charged steel stubbing, when there is a replacement if there should be some type of reimbursement to the other members. Mr. Harmon stated the retrofitting is predominantly made to bring up the ground line safety factor and they would not install the stubbing unless that had a safety factor issue. Once the safety factor issue is resolved they will be in compliance with GO 95. He stated he could see Mr. Armstrong's concern about if they are going to replace the pole then do not spend the money doing ground line reinforcement. Mr. Harmon stated for something to

be a true mutual benefit it should be there for 10 years or so not be installed and pulled out one or two years later. Ms. Ortiz stated that the pole Mr. Armstrong was referring to was replaced about two years after the steel stubbing was added which was why he was questioning it. Ms. Black stated that they should champion Mr. Armstrong's idea. She stated she pulled up the Routine Handbook and there is no date associated with steel stubbing. She stated to Mr. Harmon's point if a stub is placed there is no date in the handbook that says if a power company comes back and replaces that pole within any timeframe it is mutual benefit. If it has been remedied with the steel stub, why would it not be a mutual benefit to replace a pole at a later date. Ms. Black stated they should edit that section and put some dates around it. Mr. Harmon explained they would be looking at costs for example to replace \$40,000 and to retrofit the ground line \$10,000. That can be shared as long as they anticipate it to be utilized for 15 years or however many longer because the ground line was that area that needed reinforcement and no others. Mr. Harmon stated that 10 or 15 years they would have gotten a well worth value of the retrofitting and that there is deterioration in the pole that predicates the need to replace it. Ms. Ortiz agreed that 10-15 years will be a reasonable amount of time. Ms. Black stated she would start with 10 years and try and have something for the next month's meeting.

- **Construction Correction Process** - Ms. Ortiz opened to Construction Correction Process from Mr. Harmon. Mr. Harmon stated he would like to discuss a more efficient process because they are doing a lot of construction and a lot of times another member will go out and they will realize they are just outside of grade and space. He stated that the setting party may have not represented the exact grade and space that is on the approved JPA. He stated that party that needs to transfer to the pole cannot do it because there is not enough space on the pole. He stated the JPA is correct, and the design is correct, but they cannot physically attach to the new pole without creating an issue. He does not see any field correction process that they could do to efficiently go and mitigate that the work has not been done that long ago and can be adjusted. He stated that this was a non-binding group and the only impotence that they have to correct it would be sending a nonconformance. Mr. Harmon stated that as a carrier and they want to move a cell site to a pole, but they cannot move it because there is an attachment that is too low or too high, they are stuck. He stated GO 95 says to notice the party and let them know they created a nonconforming and to mitigate it. Mr. Harmon stated that the receiving party can look at it and

say it is low priority for them, so they then have three years to fix. He stated he does not see any mechanism to promote the need for a party who is out of grade and space to efficiently go and correct it. He stated it would be best if they could send a notice that informs them, they are out of grade and space and if they could correct it as soon as possible so they can complete their construction. He stated a lot of time they are sitting there and have jurisdictions telling them to do their work, but they cannot get on the new structure. He stated he is opening up the discussion to see if there is potentially some sort of process that they could allow for correction of construction based on an outside grade and space. Mr. Van Stryk stated that if they sent a Form 2, they would probably write on the Form 2 that they are going to move them to make the space or if the space is supposed to already be there, they could update it. Mr. Harmon stated that if it was a communication thing, they would do all the work, but if it is an energized facility a communication company cannot touch it. Ms. Mitwasi stated as part of the Form 11 revision she is putting in some standard problem statement in there to help prioritize the notifications they are receiving. She asked if that would be an avenue they would like to pursue and that she could build that on that Form as well. Mr. Harmon stated that he would prefer to not sign it as a nonconformance telling the State of California that this company is a nonconformance. He would rather say it is an “oops” to be fixed quickly. By citing it as a nonconformance the receiving party can prioritize and say that they are only out of grade and space by one foot. He stated it is not a safety issue only holds up another party’s business. He would like to make it more of a something that gets taken care of quickly and efficiently as opposed to treating it like a nonconformance instead of a mistake in the field. Mr. Van Stryk stated that they could make it a financial burden to not move because if the Form 2 was signed they should be out of that space even if it is not a GO 95 issue. Mr. Harmon stated that they do loose permit and have to go re initiate them and creates issues for jurisdictions when they have to go back and get another traffic control and hit the public. He stated that to the extent where they have a Form or notices that says they constructed outside of grade and space to please make the corrections within 30 days. He stated it is still a lot of time and reasonable. He stated most of the work was just completed where the pole was replaced, and power does their work then communication comes in after. He stated that it is hopefully within a certain reasonable timeframe and the power company could hold their contractor accountable because the power company should not be paying a contractor that did not do it per plan. He stated this can provide a kind of

quality control mechanism that says one of their members identified that they are outside of grade and space on the listed locations and to make the correction as required by the contract. He stated then the potential burden comes on the party that did not do it accurately which is most likely not the utility but the contractor. Ms. Black stated she loved the idea and that she had a real-life example where Ms. Mitwasi emailed her letting her know they were out of grade and space. She stated she understood why he did not want to put this on the Form 11 but maybe they could create a new grade and space Form. She stated she has trouble getting AT&T California's construction folks out there without anything official looking. She stated if she had a Form, she could send showing they are out of grade and space. Mr. Harmon agreed that a Grade and Space Correction Form was perfect. Mr. Van Stryk stated if there is a JPA already sent out for the antenna, he thinks a Form 7 would be good enough and was unsure if it needed its own form. Mr. Harmon stated that the reason he brought it up was because they would like it to be showing they are outside of grade and space and that a Form 7 could be just changing the pole number or other little changes. He wanted to point out the fact that it is stopping another member business and they cannot complete the construction that impacts the public because that wire is too low. The Form 7 says they are changing something. He stated he is not changing anything because the JPA is correct, but what is not correct is where the wire is. He stated that what they want to show that it was not executed properly as opposed to go through potential channels. Mr. Harmon stated he liked the idea of having a Form that states they are outside of grade and space, they have been notified, show the Form 2 and ask for the corrections to be made within the listed timeframe. Ms. Mitwasi asked if they could just repurpose the definition of the Form 11 so that it covers both the nonconformance and the grade and space to avoid creating another form that they have to try and track and manage when they can use something that they already have and create multiple functionalities. Mr. Harmon stated he would prefer something outside of the Form 11 and would like to open it to the committee to see what is preferred. Mr. Van Stryk stated why he suggested using the Form 7 was because they would want to reference where grade and space is supposed to be and then figure out why they are not at the correct grade and space. Mr. Harmon stated that the Form 2 is accurate and being outside of grade and space they will assume it happens inadvertently. He stated that if there is a quality control mechanism showing it was reported that the cable was put at 28' when it actually should be 26'. Mr. Harmon asked if they should be creating an agenda

item for this. Ms. Ortiz stated they could create an item number; the members will think about it to see if they would like to create a new form or revise/utilize the existing form that they have. *Item 1787: Construction Correction Process* was created.

- **Section 18.1** - Ms. Ortiz asked if they would like to discuss Section 18.1. The members agreed to add it to miscellaneous for the next Routine Revision meeting.

Agenda Item 9 – Review of Action items/JPA Alerts –

- Ms. Mitwasi will get back to Ms. Black regarding the “when applicable” on Section 7.3 and Engineered Steel Poles revision.
- Ms. Black will work on the definition on creating the definition of the different pole types.
- The proposed verbiage for Fire Mesh for Section 15.5 will be added to the Discussion calendar for next month.
- Ms. Black to take back the definition of Free Attachments and the members will review again next month.
- Ms. Black to revise the section for steel stubbing and adding a sort of timeline to it.
- New Item 1787: Construction Correction Process created, the members are to think about it and bring back feedback next month.
- Ms. Ortiz to work on revising Section 9.4 to make it clearer.

The Meeting adjourned at 12:03 p.m. until September 21, 2022.

Anali Spencer – Committee Staff

**FORM 7 - JOINT POLE MEMORANDUM
PULL FINAL BILL FROM BILL CYCLE
EXAMPLE xx**

(1) Protest Form 7's, are discussed in Section 18. Specifics are found in 18.1-B (2) (c), (d) & (e).

be removed from. The reason to stop billing must be included.

(2) For this transaction, the SCJPC Office must be listed under Carbon Copy TO:

(4) U1 and U2 should work together to resolve the issue. When resolved, U1 would resend the F7 with a "Resolved - OK TO BILL, and date" on it and email it to SCJPC Office.

(3) Requesting member (U1) should list the JPA No and list the Bill Cycle the final bill is to

Utility	Representative/Signature	Phone No.	J/P MEMORANDUM FORM 7 Used for additions, deletions or changes to Authorizations (See Section 18.1C)	Date: 1/3/2022
To: U2				JPA No: U2-123456
To:				Job No:
To:				
From: U1				
Dist./Exc.: 2				
Carbon Copies To: SCJPC Office			☐ SEE JPA PRELIMINARY ATTACHED	
☐ ADD	☐ CORRECT TO READ	☐ CHANGE LOCATION TO READ		
☐ DELETE	☐ CANCEL JPA	☐ REMOVE TEMPORARY ATTACHMENT FROM RECORD		
Remarks: 3				
Please remove Final Bill U2-123456 from billing cycle 1-22-U234, because U1 Form 2 changes are not entered on the FB.				

After U1 and U2 work the issue out: Resend the same Form 7, stating OK to bill. See (4).

Utility	Representative/Signature	Phone No.	J/P MEMORANDUM FORM 7 Used for additions, deletions or changes to Authorizations (See Section 18.1C)	Date: 1/3/2022
To: U2				JPA No: U2-123456
To:				Job No:
To:				
From: U1				
Dist./Exc.: 2				
Carbon Copies To: SCJPC Office			☐ SEE JPA PRELIMINARY ATTACHED	
☐ ADD	☐ CORRECT TO READ	☐ CHANGE LOCATION TO READ		
☐ DELETE	☐ CANCEL JPA	☐ REMOVE TEMPORARY ATTACHMENT FROM RECORD		
Remarks: 3				
Please remove Final Bill U2-123456 from billing cycle 1-22-U234, because U1 Form 2 changes are not entered on the FB.				
Resolved 3-30-22. OK for U2 to Final Bill.				
			4	

FINAL FORM 2 JOINT POLE AUTHORIZATION EXAMPLE 35

(1) JPAs are required to final bill in 'Date Sent' order. If there is a pending JPA(s), the RECORD information on a JPA is to reflect the PROPOSED pole information from the pending JPA to final bill first. If there are no pending JPAs, the RECORD information must match the SCJPC pole record.

Note: A FINAL JPA is not to be sent to the SCJPC until all pending JPAs (if applicable) have been final billed.

(2) Transfer all data from the Preliminary JPA to the Final JPA.

- a. APPROVED column should have the approval name or 18.1D.
- b. Type one item (Item No. or Authorized Costs) per line.

(3) Leave the Date Completed section empty.
The SCJPC office will enter this date.

(4) Enter the Form 48 date sent.

PAGE NO. 1 OF 1

Date Prepared: 1/1/2020
 Date Sent: 1/5/2020

Confirming Agreement: 1/4/2020

By: [Signature] For: [Signature]
 By: [Signature] For: [Signature]

Preliminary

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT POLE TRANSACTION

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

Estimated Construction Start Date: 2/20/2020
 JPA
 Auth. No.: U16589

UTILITY	REPRESENTATIVE	PHONE NUMBER/EMAIL	DISTRICT	DIVISION/EXCHANGE	APPROVED	ACCOUNTING DATA
U1	JONES	M.JONES@U1.COM	CENTRAL		J.BROWN	510-2345
U2	JOHNSON	D.JOHNSON@U2.COM	PASADENA		M.SMITH	W02345-51120
U3	MILLER	S.MILLER@U3.COM	SOUTHERN		R.GREEN	C80-7214

POLE NO.

5678-U1

6789-U2

RECORD

Line	15KV	C	U1	U2	U3
55	FT 2	100			
1"	E	100			
50	FT 2	43-10	27-5	22-4	
		T22			

PROPOSED

Line	15KV	C	U1	U2	U3
43-10	27-5	22-4			
34	33	33			
43-10	27-9				
	T22				

LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK

U2 & U3 TO PURCHASE SECTION 4.0 & 12.3

4TH ST A/N N/S 21' E/O GOOD AV

U1 TO RELINE SE 5.1A & 17.0

4TH ST A/N N/S 30' E/O GOOD AV

POLE LEGEND:

15KV = 15KV

C = C

U1 = U1

U2 = U2

U3 = U3

FT = FT

E = E

T22 = T22

15KV = 15KV

C = C

U1 = U1

U2 = U2

U3 = U3

FT = FT

E = E

T22 = T22

15KV = 15KV

C = C

U1 = U1

U2 = U2

U3 = U3

FT = FT

E = E

T22 = T22

GEOPHYSICAL LOCATION

ALHAMBRA

COUNTY

FORM 48 SENT

FINAL

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT POLE TRANSACTION

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

PAGE NO. 1 OF 1

Date Prepared: 1/1/2020
 Date Sent: 1/5/2020

Confirming Agreement: 1/4/2020

By: [Signature] For: [Signature]
 By: [Signature] For: [Signature]

Final

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT POLE TRANSACTION

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

Estimated Construction Start Date: 2/20/2020
 JPA
 Auth. No.: U16589

UTILITY	REPRESENTATIVE	PHONE NUMBER/EMAIL	DISTRICT	DIVISION/EXCHANGE	APPROVED	ACCOUNTING DATA
U1	JONES	M.JONES@U1.COM	CENTRAL		J.BROWN	510-2345
U2	JOHNSON	D.JOHNSON@U2.COM	PASADENA		M.SMITH	W02345-51120
U3	MILLER	S.MILLER@U3.COM	SOUTHERN		R.GREEN	C80-7214

POLE NO.

5678-U1

6789-U2

RECORD

Line	15KV	C	U1	U2	U3
55	FT 2	100			
1"	E	100			
50	FT 2	43-10	27-5	22-4	
		T22			

PROPOSED

Line	15KV	C	U1	U2	U3
43-10	27-5	22-4			
34	33	33			
43-10	27-9				
	T22				

LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK

U2 & U3 TO PURCHASE SECTION 4.0 & 12.3

4TH ST A/N N/S 21' E/O GOOD AV

U1 TO RELINE SE 5.1A & 17.0

4TH ST A/N N/S 30' E/O GOOD AV

POLE LEGEND:

15KV = 15KV

C = C

U1 = U1

U2 = U2

U3 = U3

FT = FT

E = E

T22 = T22

15KV = 15KV

C = C

U1 = U1

U2 = U2

U3 = U3

FT = FT

E = E

T22 = T22

15KV = 15KV

C = C

U1 = U1

U2 = U2

U3 = U3

FT = FT

E = E

T22 = T22

GEOPHYSICAL LOCATION

ALHAMBRA

COUNTY

FORM 48 SENT 3/20/2020

COETS and BILLING DATA

BILLING CODES

1. PLACED CURRENT YEAR

2. PLACED PRIOR YEAR

3. UNAUTHORIZED ATTACHMENT

4. DIALING VALUE

5. AUTHORIZED COSTS

BILL NO.

AMOUNT DUE

LINE CODE	AMOUNT	TOTAL AMT
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		

**PRELIMINARY JOINT POLE AUTHORIZATION
ADDING GPS COORDINATES TO POLE LOCATIONS
EXAMPLE xx**

(1) This transaction shows how to add GPS coordinates for a pole location.

Use WGS84 formatting, with 6 to 8 digits, and place under the Section 15.4 pole location address. (8 digits is most accurate.)

(2) When the pole is replaced, it will move one foot on the address line, but using the same GPS coordinates is ok.

NOTE: Adding GPS coordinates are optional, but are highly recommended.

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT POLE TRANSACTION J.P. FORM 2-1 Preliminary 1/95

Date Prepared 4/14/2014 This authorization is in accordance with Joint Pole Agreement and Routine. The undersigned have agreed on joint work as specified hereon.

Date Sent 4/16/2014 Confirming Agreement In Field ☐ By Telephone ☐ Est. Const. Start No. of Pages 1 J.P. Auth. No. U3-123-456

UTILITY	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT-DIVISION-EXCHANGE	APPROVED	TAXING INSTRUCTIONS	ACCOUNTING DATA
U1	JONES	LOS ANGELES	JONES	LOS ANGELES	5577303
U2	JOHNSON	LOS ANGELES	JOHNSON	LOS ANGELES	A403
U3	SMITH	LOS ANGELES	SMITH	LOS ANGELES	12345

POLE NO.	Pole Length Anchor Size	Year Set	Pole Id. Class Anchor Dist.	Record			Proposed			Item No.	LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK If not in accordance with Joint Pole agreement and routine-state reasons.	
				U1	U2		U1	U2	U3			
				L			L				U1 TO REPLACE POLE FOR BENEFIT OF U3 SEC 7.3, 10.8	1
1234U1	45	02	FT	38-9	24-8		PTD				DREAM RD S/S 212' W/O ONE WAY	2
			CL-3								33.881958, -118.274545	1
							1	1		83	U3 TO PAY U1 & U2 FOR TRANSFER	4
												5
5678U1	50	14	FT				43-13	23-5	24-1		DREAM RD S/S 211' W/O ONE WAY	6
											33.881958, -118.274545	2
												7
												8
												9
												10
												11
												12
												13

POLE LEGEND: L = LOWER TOP (Item SE)
P = PULL (Item 5A) C(PX) = 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

NEVERLAND COMMUNITY

VPJ.P.-03
Rev. Jul 2013

Date **ITEM 1783**

Prepared 4/14/2014

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT POLE TRANSACTION

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

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

Date
Sent 4/16/2014Confirming
AgreementIn
Field ☐By
Telephone ☐Est.
Const.
StartNo. of
Pages 1J.P.
Auth.No. U3-123-456

UTILITY	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT-DIVISION-EXCHANGE	APPROVED	TAXING INSTRUCTIONS	ACCOUNTING DATA
U1	JONES	LOS ANGELES	JONES	LOS ANGELES	5577303
U2	JOHNSON	LOS ANGELES	JOHNSON	LOS ANGELES	A403
U3	SMITH	LOS ANGELES	SMITH	LOS ANGELES	12345

POLE NO.	Pole Length Anchor Size	Year Set	Pole Trt	Record				Proposed					Item No.	LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK If not in accordance with Joint Pole agreement and routine-state reasons.
			Class											
			Anchor Direct.	U1	U2			U1	U2	U3				
				L				L						U1 TO REPLACE POLE FOR BENEFIT OF U3 SEC 7.3, 10.8 1
1234U1	45	02	FT	39-9	24-6			PTD						DREAM RD S/S 212' W/O ONE WAY 2
			CL-3											33.881958, -118.274545 1 3
								1	1				83	U3 TO PAY U1 & U2 FOR TRANSFER 4
														5
5678U1	50	14	FT					43-13	23-5	24-1				DREAM RD S/S 211' W/O ONE WAY 6
														33.881958, -118.274545 2 7
														8
														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

NEVERLAND
COMMUNITY

VP/J.P.-03

Rev. Jul 2013

New section.

15.4- B GPS Coordinates

The GPS Coordinates, when known, can be listed under the 15.4 Pole Location Address on the LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK side of the Form 2. The coordinates should be 6 to 8 digits (8 being most accurate) and be formatted to WGS84 standard. Adding the GPS coordinates is optional but highly recommended when the existing pole record does not list it. See Example xx in Section 18, page 18-xx.

Under Section 18.1 A – add red below

RECORD FORMS

18.0 Record Forms

The forms used for expediting joint pole work and recording transactions are listed below:

Form #	Form Name
2-1	Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization
2-2	Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization
2-1 FINAL	Final Joint Pole Authorization
2-2 FINAL	Final Joint Pole Authorization
Form 7	Joint Pole Memorandum
Form 9	Joint Pole Riser Notification
Form 11	Notice of GO 95 Non-Conformance
Form 12	Pole Record
Form 16	Reallocation of Space
Form 44	Bill of Sale
Form 48	Notice of Work Completed
Form 49	Tracer

Hard or soft copies shall be provided as agreed by the parties.

(Revised January 2015)

18.1 Form 2 - Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization

Any agreement to undertake joint work must be confirmed in writing by using this form. This is authority to undertake joint work as specified. Member initiating transaction shall make necessary copies for each Member involved, all of which must be approved by an authorized representative of each involved Member. Approval may be by signature of the authorized representative to be shown on the forms in the space provided, or by the authorized representative's name, followed by the written initials of a delegated representative confirming the agreement. Names of representatives effecting agreement must be specified in space provided. Members that have various designated District, Division, or Exchange areas should identify the appropriate area by name. The Joint Pole Authorization number is assigned by the issuing Member. The Joint Pole Authorization number should begin with the Initiator's Member code and can have a maximum of 23 alpha or numeric characters only. The only exceptions are blank spaces or hyphens within the 23 maximum character count. If the Form 2 is revised, characters like RO1 or COR are not included in the maximum 23-character count for the F2 name (Revised March 2021).

18.1-A Preparation of Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization

By agreement, any Member may be designated as the constructing Member in joint work.

The Member initiating Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization shall specify its Authorization number and all required details of the agreement. The Joint Pole Authorization number shall begin with the current member's code. The Form 2 shall include, but is not limited to:

- (a) Pole Number
- (b) Nature of work
- (c) Applicable Routine Section Number
- (d) Designation of involved Members
- (e) Circuits
- (f) Interest
- (g) Grade
- (h) Space
- (i) Pole/equipment data, including jointly owned arms, anchors, risers, wireless and broadband equipment.
- (j) Other essential record data i.e. tenants, power communication (P.Comm)
- (k) Authorized Costs item number and number of items where required
- (l) Police and/or fire report or case number when applicable and available
- (m) Provide billing information when applicable billing sections are used
- (n) Estimated construction start date
- (o) Date sent
- (p) Date prepared
- (q) Pole Class for wood poles
- (r) Additional notes such as pending JPA numbers or corrections per field conditions
- (s) Pole loading analysis only for poles associated with the JPA. NOTE: (1) Members cannot dictate pole loading method and format however must meet all GO95 requirements (2) Section 4.1 refer to the section.
- (t) Optional drawing/map: highlight only the poles associated with the JPA (Revised June 2020).
- (u) GPS coordinates. (Optional)

The Preliminary Form 2 shall be limited to 10 pages.

Where a specific transaction involves special agreement, it shall be designated as such on Joint Pole Authorization. (See Section 1.2)

It is the responsibility of all Members involved in the Joint Pole Authorization to see that data and details of the agreement are correct. The date Joint Pole Authorization is sent shall be used in completing the billing for structural and salvage values; except in replacements, the date poles are set shall apply.

Any deviation shall be by agreement of the Members involved and noted on the Joint Pole

FORM 50
GPS Coordinates Addition/Correction

Utility Representative Phone No. or E-Mail

To: _____ Date: _____

From: _____

No.	SCJPC Unique ID	Pole Number	Existing Latitude	New/Updated Latitude	Existing Longitude	New/Updated Longitude
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						

Approved Date: _____ Denial Date: _____

Approved By: _____ Denied By: _____

Date Sent to SCJPC: _____ Reason for Denial: _____

18.11 Form 50 – GPS Coordinates Addition/Correction

This form is used to notify the base owner of the addition/correction of a joint pole's GPS coordinates.

This form is not to be used for a pole pending on a JPA as the addition/correction is to be addressed on the pending JPA.

The form shall be sent to the base owner for review. If base owner approves the proposed GPS coordinates, the approved form will be returned to the sender and to the SCJPC for pole record update. If the base owner denies the proposed GPS coordinates, a reason will be provided, and form is to be returned to sender.

Response is to be received from base owner within 45 days.

See Example XX, page 18-XX.

Engineered Steel RH verbiage changes

3.14 Notice of Intention to Construct Other than Wood Pole.

If constructing Member, to accommodate other members' requirements, is involved in expense exceeding that required for its facilities when alone, purchase of interest by Member desiring to participate in joint ownership shall be made when poles and anchors have been installed according to approved plan.

Section 1.2 required for Engineered Steel Poles (Revised January 2008). (See loading requirement notes in Section 15.4, for ES-1 and ES-2 poles.)

7.3 Overbuild

This section provides for the replacement of a solely owned or a jointly owned pole, less than 25 years old for the sole benefit of an incoming Member or one joint owner. This section also applies to poles replaced due to damage caused by facilities of a joint owner, poles replaced due to California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) mandates directed at specific member facilities, and to all solely owned or jointly owned poles replaced for the sole benefit of Members

having less than 20 consecutive years of Joint Pole Committee membership.

The cost to benefiting Member shall include:

- (a) Equity of overbuilt Member's structural value of existing pole, less salvage
- (b) Cost of transfer
- (c) Additional material installed to comply with requirements of joint ownership
- (d) Sidewalk or pavement repairs
- (e) Entire removal cost

The sole owner, or each joint owner as appropriate, shall bill the benefiting Member for the portion of pulling and transportation it performs. The Member recovering pole shall allow salvage to other owner(s) for its relinquished interest. Member placing new pole shall bill an interest to other Members.

When a benefiting Member replaces pole and another Member desires additional grade or space, replacement shall be made in accordance with rule of the Routine relating to Section 7.11. Mutual benefit shall not apply where a non-benefiting owner is forced to increase grade or space as a result of the activities undertaken by the benefiting Member.

7.14 Replacement of Wood Pole with Other than Wood Pole.

Member replacing wood pole with other than wood pole for mutual benefit, shall sell interest in new pole to other Members concerned. Each member shall transfer at own expense, receive salvage, and pay pulling and transportation. Mutual benefit shall be understood to apply under this section as follows:

- (a) Pole 25 years old or more

ITEM 1784 ENGINEERED STEEL POLES

- (b) Pole less than 25 years old, but rendered unfit for service by any cause not the fault of a joint owner including existing overloaded poles. (Revised April 2015)
- (c) Pole requiring relocation for the benefit of all Members concerned
- (d) Pole identified in authorized maintenance inspection program as unfit for service
- (e) Pole requiring replacement for clearing of discovered existing General Order 95 infractions not the fault of any joint owner.
- (f) Pole replaced prior to Form 2 and Form 48. Form 2 must be noted that this is a Priority Pole. Section 7.13 applies only if Form 2 is not issued within 45 days. (Revised February 2017)
- (g) Pole replacements initiated to fulfill CPUC mandated requirements directed to Members with specific facilities, shall be Section 7.3.

For poles that are more than 25 years old, this section applies only to Members having more than 20 consecutive years of Joint Pole Committee membership.

For those Members with less than 20 consecutive years of Joint Pole Committee membership, which initiates the replacement of poles under the provisions of (a) above, Section 7.3 shall apply.

This rule shall also apply where owner failed to issue Notice of Intention for pole and incoming Member desires its replacement within three years, beginning with January 1 following date of its installation. If pole has been installed longer than the three-year period specified and is not more than 25 years old, the replacement shall be in accordance with rule of the Routine relating to Section 7.3.

Section 1.2 required for Engineered Steel Poles. (See loading requirement notes in Section 15.4, for ES-1 and ES-2 poles.)

Note: The setting member will PTD other than wood poles.
(Revised January 2011).

15.5 Alternative To Wood Poles

CF (Composite Fiberglass – single piece)

CM (Composite Fiberglass – multi pieces)

LS (Lightweight Steel)

HS (Heavy Steel)

CP (Concrete Pole)

DI (Ductile Iron)

HD (Heavy Ductile Iron)

ES-1 (Engineered Steel – Additional load can be added per GO 95 Rule 44.3, see note below regarding “reserve load” being required.) **Member claiming a “NO more additional load” as reason for denial of access shall provide denied member a written rejection of their attachment request with proof that this additional load shall lower the Safety Factor to below the GO 95 minimums.

ES-2 (Engineered Steel – Ok to add additional load.)

Notation: Engineered Steel poles require Section 1.2. Any Member setting an ES-1 Engineered Steel pole as a replacement to a Wood pole must incur all cost above and beyond the cost to install a wood pole that would have met the 4.0 safety factor. New ES-1 Pole setting member can share cost above and beyond a 4.0 SF wood pole if that member can show a CPUC authority allowing such action. These costs can also be shared thru mutual agreement and a Section 1.2. New ES-1 Pole setting member must send all other occupying members a final set of Loading Calculations that contain values that show a minimum 1.5 Safety Factor on the steel structure, a

ITEM 1784 ENGINEERED STEEL POLES

2.0 Safety Factor for overturn-*Lateral Bearing* and a 1.5 Safety Factor when calculating uplift. Soil inspection reports and tested values shall also be provided upon demand as a part of any GO 95 Rule 44.4 request. The Safety factors derived from final loads (Kips, KSF) shall be stamped by a Civil PE. Any Form 2 initiating an ES-1 pole (either solely or joint) after xxxx, 202x that does not add in this reserve load, the base owner will need to replace the ES-1 pole as a 7.3 upon a new Member applying for ownership.

(Revised January 2008). (LS & CP revised June 2008). (DI, CM added January 2011). (HS,HD added October 2013).

Fire Mesh verbiage changes

15.5 Length, Year Set and Treatment of Pole

The length, year set and treatment of pole must be accurately given on Joint Pole Authorization as these data constitute the basis upon which price is fixed for interest in pole in accordance with schedules of structural values. For purposes of type of treatment, they shall be listed on the Joint Pole Authorization as Butt Treated (T), Full Treated (FT), Gray (G) or Additional Treatment (AT).

Types of treatment included in these groupings are as follows. **These category grouping types are required information on a preliminary Form 2:**

T (Butt Treated)

Creosote or Pentachlorophenol

FT (Full Treated) Creosote Pentachlorophenol Cellon - Natural

ColorChemonite

Copper Naphthenate **(No Fire Mesh Wrap added.)**

FTW (Full Treated with Fire Mesh Wrap added)

G (Gray)

Gray Stained - Cellon Gray Stained - Chemonite

Gray Stained - Butt Treated Cedar

AT Methylisothiocyanate-MITC FUME or WoodFume

UltraFume

Disodium octaborate teraglydrate-Tim-borFluorod

Disodium octaborate-Boron rods

15.5-A Additional Treatment of Joint Poles

Mutual agreement must be obtained prior to additional treatment of existing joint poles. The actual Chemical used for additional treatment will be identified on the preliminary joint pole authorization.

Fire Mesh Wrap is specifically designed to withstand wildfires by adding a protective layer, as an additional treatment on the pole. When a Base Owner decides it is necessary, Fire Mesh Wrap can be placed on poles in High Fire Threat District areas. These wrapped poles will have FTW treatment category groupings listed on the preliminary joint pole authorization. **NOTE: Poles with this wrap can be climbed with gaffs or can have pole steps placed on it after the wrap is installed. Prod, Intrusive and Sound testing of the pole is not hampered by the wrap. Any small tears measuring XXXXX done to the wrap, do not need to be repaired. Any tear larger than XXXX is something the base owner would like to repair. The base owners who place this wrap request to be notified of tears larger than XXXXX, via the contact email listed under "Pole Inspection Contacts and Resources" on the spreadsheet labeled "SCJPC Pole Inspection Contacts", on the SCJPC website. For additional information regarding Fire Wrap, please see the Q&A document regarding Fire Wrap under "Pole Inspection Contacts and Resources" under SCE Fire Mesh Wrap Q&A document, on the SCJPC website.**

MISC: FIRE MESH

Do we need something in the glossary?

MISC: FREE ATTACHMENT DEFINITION

Free Attachments

Free attachment is defined as allowing another member to attach to an existing pole at no charge

Free Attachments apply to the following conditions;

To be used for service attachment as a direct path to a point of attachment that will serve their customer and when the Free attachment pole allows for service clearance for all GO.95 requirements. Multiple poles in close proximity the incoming member will pay to attach to the first pole attachment and the successive attachment shall be free (three pole rack)

MISC: FREE ATTACHMENT DEFINITION

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 2:42 PM
To: Anali Spencer
Subject: FREE ATTACHMENT from August 2022 meeting Fw: FOR TODAY RR AD HOC FW: [EXTERNAL] Free attachment Verbiage

From: BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2022 9:26 AM
To: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>; Maria Ortiz <MOrtiz@motiveis.com>; Bacon, John R. <John.Bacon@ladwp.com>; Kathleen Allen <kathleen@scjpc.net>
Cc: YOUNG, JOY A <jv2453@att.com>
Subject: FOR TODAY RR AD HOC FW: [EXTERNAL] Free attachment Verbiage

Sorry I forgot to send this to Angela and Maria for today.

Can we discuss this definition when we get to the item in the RR ad hoc please?

Kay Black

West ACE VP Staff – Joint Pole
2125 Occidental Road
Santa Rosa, CA 95403



From: Bacon, John R. <John.Bacon@ladwp.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2022 2:18 PM
To: BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Free attachment Verbiage

Perfect, thank you very much Kay I will make a final definition with the paragraph you provided

From: BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2022 2:07 PM
To: Bacon, John R. <John.Bacon@ladwp.com>; Kathleen Allen <kathleen@scjpc.net>
Cc: YOUNG, JOY A <jv2453@att.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Free attachment Verbiage

EXTERNAL EMAIL! This email was generated from a non-LADWP address. If any links exist, do not click/open on them unless you are 100% certain of the associated site or source. ALWAYS hover over the link to preview the actual URL/site and confirm its legitimacy.

How is this John?

New for the Glossary:

Free Attachment

Free attachments are specific to paralleling Member's leads with service conductors crossing thoroughfares directly to a premise served. Free attachment requirements are detailed in Section 11.0 and depicted in Examples A through E on Page 11-2. (A free attachment remains a Free attachment when the pole is replaced.)

Kathleen – can you confirm there is no billing when the pole is replaced? Free stays Free?

Not like an interset CLR, where the CLR member on a replacement becomes an owner.

Please let us know if I have this right. Thanks.

Kay Black

West ACE VP Staff – Joint Pole
2125 Occidental Road
Santa Rosa, CA 95403



-----Confidentiality Notice-----

This electronic message transmission contains information from the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, which may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail and delete the original message and any attachment without reading or saving in any manner.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 599-3801

September 21, 2022

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, **at 10:34 a.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:**

Ms. Maria Ortiz	XO Communications
Ms. Alicia Walsh	Southern California Edison
Ms. Valerie Mitwasi	Southern California Edison
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Glenn Leckie	Frontier Communications
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Mr. Joe Serrato	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Megan LaMon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Jeremy Harmon	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Katy White	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time Warner Cable
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel Corporation/Sprint Communications CO.L. P
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Barry Consulter	AT&T California
Mr. Todd Dailey	AT&T California
Ms. Veronica Romero	AT&T California
Ms. Joy Young	AT&T California
Mr. Alvin Robielos	AT&T California
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Ms. Yvonne Johnson	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Nicholas Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Ms. Linda McLean	Extenet Systems
Ms. Heidi Seropian	Extenet Systems
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Services Inc.
Mr. Renzo Garzon	Mobilitie, LLC
Ms. Patti Ringo	Sonic Telecom, LLC
Mr. Kenneth Haley	Sonic Telecom, LLC
Mr. Anthony Ghilardi	City of Pasadena
Mr. Mina Shehata	City of Burbank
Mr. Arturo Garcia	City of Glendale
Mr. Alex Parra	City of Riverside
Mr. David Campo	City of Lompoc
Ms. Ariel Dunning	City of Colton

Ms. Alyssa Aguilar	City of Colton
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Ms. Erica Cassadas	City of Banning
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff
Ms. Anali Spencer	Committee Staff

Ms. Ortiz called the meeting to order at 10:34 a.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Review of prior month’s meeting minutes - Ms. Ortiz opened the meeting by inquiring if there were any questions or concerns regarding the previous meeting minutes. There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 2 – Interpretation of Routine Handbook – Ms. Ortiz opened the discussion to the members for any questions regarding the Routine Handbook. There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 3 – Item 1597: Review of Routine Handbook Examples (5/19/2015) – Ms. Ortiz opened the discussion on Review of Routine Handbook Examples. Ms. LaFenais suggested an example. She stated that Bear Valley Electric quite often finds poles that were placed many years ago with no record created for them. It has come to the point where they are removing and replacing them but was unsure of the sections to use when a pole is found out in the field. She asked if an example of a pole found in the field could be made for the Routine Handbook. Mr. Bacon stated that when LADWP comes across poles that they have no record of, LADWP creates their own pole record. They will create a pole number for LADWP only poles with the M based number and they will create grades and space for that JPA, and they add a 13.X to update the records. Ms. LaFrenais stated she has poles that have old pole numbers on them. Ms. LaFrenais stated there is no money involved other than saying it is being removed and replaced with a new pole and she would like to capture the old pole information in case down the line she finds another JPA where it did say it was taken out and she would like to know it has been resolved. Mr. Bacon stated they could use the old number and that LADWP adds a note that it is a new pole record with the old pole number and add the grades & space. Mr. Bacon stated it is creating a new record. Ms. LaFrenais stated she would explain differently what she meant, she stated she finds a pole in the field and they are going to remove and replace it with a new pole and wanted to know if on the JPA itself when she identifies the old pole number that is not in the SCJPC records, she is looking for the section that says the pole did not exist in the SCJPC records and it is now being removed and replaced. She stated if there are communications out there, she cannot put that the communications are being moved if the old pole number does not exist. Ms. Ortiz stated that if the old pole shows as joint and there is no record then the SCJPC cannot process the final. Ms. LaFrenais

was asking for an example because she was probably not the only person to come across this issue. Ms. Ortiz asked Ms. LaFrenais if she had a JPA being processed to use for this type of example. Ms. LaFrenais did not have one at this time. Ms. Black suggested to use the pole that was found to create an example. Ms. Ortiz asked to make sure it was not a solely owned pole where the communication was unauthorized, and the members mutually agreed that it is a joint pole. Ms. LaFrenais stated it is a joint pole but not in the SCJPC records. Ms. Black asked if Ms. LaFrenais would just use on the pole being removed Section 13.3 and wording in the Nature of Work saying no existing pole records to create one. Ms. Ortiz stated depending on the pole number it would determine the base owner. Ms. LaFrenais stated that the example she has is a Bear Valley Electric pole but that she has others that are from Contel, which no longer exists as a company. Ms. Allen stated that Contel is now Frontier. Ms. LaFrenais stated she has reached out to Frontier, and they also do not have a record. Ms. Allen stated that if Ms. LaFrenais could provide her the information with Bear Valley Electric and Frontier Communications agreeing the pole is joint, a record can be established. However, both companies must agree it is a joint pole. Ms. Allen stated the SCJPC has never accepted a 13.3 to establish pole record unless both parties agreed. Ms. Allen stated if Ms. LaFrenais comes across poles where for example Bear Valley Electric and Frontier Communications agree the pole is joint, Ms. LaFrenais could email Ms. Allen the pole information and she could type it into the database to establish the record. Ms. LaFrenais stated she could forward her conversations with Frontier Communications, showing that they both agree. Ms. LaFrenais asked what section would be used, if it was Section 13.3. Ms. Allen stated that a Section would not be used, just an email to Ms. Allen so she can establish the record. That is how it has been done in the past and as long as both utilities agree the pole is joint a record could be established. Once Ms. LaFrenais does the JPA it will be done by the sections in the Routine Handbook. Ms. Allen gave the example for a replacement, Ms. LaFrenais would use a Section 7.X and if the record is established, they put the old pole on the JPA, and it will be removed to get the new one in and be done. Ms. LaFrenais thanked Ms. Allen. Ms. Pranata asked if Ms. LaFrenais still wanted an example in the Routine Handbook. Ms. LaFrenais stated if Ms. Allen is going to establish a record without the need for a JPA, based that both joint owners agreeing that the pole is joint in the field, she stated she does not think one is needed, but Ms. LaFrenais is unsure how to document that for anyone going forward who is new in this committee. Ms. Pranata asked Ms. Ortiz if they could do a *JPA Alert*. Ms. Pranata stated that the members who have been on the committee for a long time know what to do but the members that are newer do not know. Ms. Ortiz stated that she hesitates creating an alert because there could be a record for an existing pole out there and somewhere along the line it was replaced and then the pole is being replaced again and then a very old record is going to stay active for the same location. Ms. Ortiz stated that instead of doing the research members may just decide to create a record. Ms. Ortiz stated that she hesitates

putting it out as an alert or even as an example because then it will be an easy “go to” instead of doing research. Ms. Ortiz stated that she still thinks they need to put in the work and asked how often this happens. Ms. Allen stated that it is happening more and more often and if the members would like to make a section for establishing record, but that both parties should agree. Ms. LaFrenais asked if they could put it under miscellaneous. Ms. Mitwasi stated that if they do a *JPA Alert* they could add a note stating that when there is no existing record to work with the committee staff. She stated that does not really outline a specific process on it to provide some clear direction. Ms. Pranata asked Ms. Ortiz if she would like to draft a *JPA Alert*. Ms. Ortiz stated that she will draft up a *JPA Alert*. Ms. LaFrenais stated she will send Ms. Allen the pole she was working on and that could be used if necessary. Ms. Allen agreed with Ms. LaFrenais sending over the information. Ms. Ortiz stated if she has any questions when writing up the *JPA Alert* she will reach out to Ms. Allen.

Ms. Ortiz asked if there were any other new examples that any members would like to review or discuss. There were no further comments or concerns at this time.

Agenda Item 4 - Item 1783: Lat and Long on the Form 2 (from Administrative Board – 2/16/2022). – Ms. Ortiz opened to lat./long. on the Form 2. Ms. Ortiz stated this was tabled last month for Mr. Bacon to join the meeting. Ms. Black stated that they have gone back and forth and this has been revised several times but that they all seem to be in agreement with this verbiage. Mr. Bacon stated that it is fine with the way that it is being set up and that he has a question on his side at LADWP that he needs to ask for their database and how to enter it and see if it was going to coincide with it, which was his only agenda item for this. Mr. Bacon stated that LADWP is fine with the way it is. Mr. Parra asked if there was a range for when they install a pole two to five feet away where they should need to look up new GPS coordinates or if they use it as an approximate location. Ms. Black asked to go to the example for GPS Coordinates (see attached). She stated that the exact same GPS coordinate is listed twice, even the pole replacement. She stated that it was decided that just because they placed the pole a foot or so away, they did not need to update the GPS coordinates. She stated it is number two on the example instructions. Ms. Black stated if there is no one is opposed then this could be moved over to Discussion next month. Ms. Ortiz asked if there was any more discussion on this. There were no comments or concerns. Ms. Ortiz stated that this was being moved to the October Administrative Board Discussion calendar.

Agenda Item 5 - Item 1784: Engineered Steel Poles (from Administrative Board – 2/16/2022). - Ms. Ortiz opened to Engineered Steel Poles. Ms. Ortiz stated this was discussed at the Administrative Board meeting and would be in Consent next month and asked if there was anything else that they needed to discuss. There were no comments or concerns from the members.

Agenda Item 6 - Item 1787: Construction Correction Process (M. Ortiz - XO Communication - 07/11/22). – Ms. Ortiz opened to Construction Correction Process and stated that Mr. Harmon had messaged her that he had to drop out of the meeting and requested to table this item for the next month.

Agenda Item 7 – Miscellaneous Issues –

- **Fire Mesh verbiage Sec 15. 5 (3/16/2022):** Ms. Ortiz opened to the proposed verbiage for Section 15.5 for Fire Mesh. Ms. Black stated that Item is on Consent for next month.
- **Adding the definition of Free Attachment** in the Routine Handbook from SCJPC Office (4/13/2022) - Ms. Ortiz opened to adding the definition of Free Attachment to the Routine Handbook. Mr. Bacon thanked Ms. Black for taking over this one. Ms. Black stated there was discussion from last month about having service dropped defined, how many in a span, and more verbiage required on that. Ms. Black asked Mr. Van Stryk if he brought anything he wanted to add on there. Mr. Van Stryk did not have anything. Mr. Bacon stated his question was when does it become a feed line and when is it a service. He stated when they route the feed to a house on the other side of the alley it would become a free attachment but if they are going across the alley with one line and the other six services are going off that does it still remain a free attachment. Mr. Bacon stated that if it is a service point for a Clearance, then he agrees that they should all be a Free Attachment. Ms. Black looked through her notes and stated she had written that “no messenger is attached, and the drop is only one span.” She asked if they agreed last month that would be the definition of a service drop. Mr. Bacon stated that he liked it. Mr. Treepaisan stated that is pretty consistent with what they have up north where they get one Free Attachment. Mr. Treepaisan stated that it seems like Mr. Van Stryk and Mr. Bacon were looking for more clarification than the basic definition that they currently had. Ms. Black asked if the definition where the Free Attachment will not have a messenger and only goes one span would that be accurate and good. Mr. Bacon stated he likes the one span language because then they are all service points. Mr. Treepaisan agreed and stated that one span and no messenger is pretty much the verbiage they use in the north. Ms. Black stated that she will take it back to edit and add the verbiage in. She asked if the members were ok to put it for Discussion calendar or if they needed to keep it in the ad hoc.

Ms. Ortiz stated that she thinks they can add it to Discussion after she makes the revisions. Ms. Black stated she will work on it that day to send out.

- Ms. Ortiz stated she was also going to also revise Section 9.4. Ms. Ortiz read through the section and stated it states, “for the benefit of owner of pole, the Member maintaining clearance attachment.” She asked if that was clear that they are maintaining the attachment on the new pole or if it still was not clear enough. Ms. Ortiz stated that they also have Example 33 that shows a pole replacement with the member with the Clearance attachment on the new pole like they have it on the old pole. The members reviewed Example 33. Ms. Ortiz stated that number three on the example shows that the members require additional footage and the new pole the Member will be a joint owner with grades and space instead of a Clearance attachment. She stated that they could add a note to Section 9.4 to reference Example 33, instead of revising the section. Ms. Ortiz asked the members if that would work. Ms. Black agreed. Ms. Ortiz asked Ms. Pranata if under Section 9.4 she could add a note to reference Example 33. Mr. Van Stryk asked if the note for number three on the example could be updated for further clarity. Ms. Ortiz stated she could update the note for the next month’s Routine Revision meeting.
- **Nonconformance/Form 11** - Ms. Ortiz opened to Nonconformance/Form 11 for Ms. Mitwasi. Ms. Mitwasi asked to table this item for the next meeting.
- **Steel Stubbing** - Ms. Ortiz opened to Steel Stubbing from Mr. Armstrong. Ms. Black was going to revise the section for steel stubbing. Ms. Black asked to table this item for next month.

Ms. Ortiz asked if there were any other miscellaneous items. There were no further comments or concerns from the members.

Agenda Item 8 – Review of Action items/JPA Alerts –

- Ms. Ortiz will create a draft of a *JPA Alert* to establish a record.
- Item 1783 will be added to October’s Discussion calendar.
- Ms. Ortiz will revise Example 33 to make number three clearer.

The Meeting adjourned at 11:03 a.m. until October 19, 2022.

Anali Spencer – Committee Staff

**PRELIMINARY JOINT POLE AUTHORIZATION
ADDING GPS COORDINATES TO POLE LOCATIONS
EXAMPLE xx**

- (1) This transaction shows how to add GPS coordinates for a pole location.

Use WGS84 formatting, with 6 to 8 digits, and place under the Section 15.4 pole location address. (8 digits is most accurate.)

- (2) When the pole is replaced, it will move one foot on the address line, but using the same GPS coordinates is ok.

NOTE: When the existing SCJPC pole card does not have the GPS Coordinates, adding them to a Form 2 is preferred, but not required and should not be a reason for denial.

Date
Prepared 4/14/2022

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

Date
Sent 4/16/2022Confirming
AgreementIn
Field ☐By
Telephone ☐Est.
Const.
StartNo. of
Pages 1J.P.
Auth.No. U3-123-456

UTILITY	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT-DIVISION-EXCHANGE	APPROVED	TAXING INSTRUCTIONS	ACCOUNTING DATA
U1	JONES	LOS ANGELES	JONES	LOS ANGELES	5577303
U2	JOHNSON	LOS ANGELES	JOHNSON	LOS ANGELES	A403
U3	SMITH	LOS ANGELES	SMITH	LOS ANGELES	12345

POLE NO.	Pole Length Anchor Size	Year Set	Pole Trt	Record				Proposed					Item No.	LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK If not in accordance with Joint Pole agreement and routine-state reasons.
			Class											
			Anchor Direct.	U1	U2	U3		U1	U2	U3				
				L				L						U1 TO REPLACE POLE FOR BENEFIT OF U3 SEC 7.3, 10.8 1
1234U1	45	02	FT	39-9	23-5	24-1		PTD						DREAM RD S/S 212' W/O ONE WAY 2
			CL-3											33.881958, -118.274545 1 3
								1	1			83		U3 TO PAY U1 & U2 FOR TRANSFER 4
														5
5678U1	50	14	FT					43-13	23-5	24-1				DREAM RD S/S 211' W/O ONE WAY 6
														33.881958, -118.274545 2 7
														8
														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

NEVERLAND
COMMUNITY

VP/J.P.-03

Rev. Jul 2013

New section. 15.4- B GPS Coordinates

The GPS Coordinates, when known, can be listed under the 15.4 Pole Location Address on the LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK side of the Form 2. The coordinates should be 6 to 8 digits (8 being most accurate) and be formatted to WGS84 standard. When the existing SCJPC pole card does not have the GPS Coordinates, adding them to a Form 2 is preferred, but not required and should not be a reason for denial. See Example xx in Section 18, page 18-xx.

Under Section 18.1 A – add red below

RECORD FORMS

18.0 Record Forms

The forms used for expediting joint pole work and recording transactions are listed below:

Form #	Form Name
2-1	Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization
2-2	Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization
2-1 FINAL	Final Joint Pole Authorization
2-2 FINAL	Final Joint Pole Authorization
Form 7	Joint Pole Memorandum
Form 9	Joint Pole Riser Notification
Form 11	Notice of GO 95 Non-Conformance
Form 12	Pole Record
Form 16	Reallocation of Space
Form 44	Bill of Sale
Form 48	Notice of Work Completed
Form 49	Tracer

Hard or soft copies shall be provided as agreed by the parties.

(Revised January 2015)

18.1 Form 2 - Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization

Any agreement to undertake joint work must be confirmed in writing by using this form. This is authority to undertake joint work as specified. Member initiating transaction shall make necessary copies for each Member involved, all of which must be approved by an authorized representative of each involved Member. Approval may be by signature of the authorized representative to be shown on the forms in the space provided, or by the authorized representative's name, followed by the written initials of a delegated representative confirming the agreement. Names of representatives effecting agreement must be specified in space provided. Members that have various designated District, Division, or Exchange areas should identify the appropriate area by name. The Joint Pole Authorization number is assigned by the issuing Member. The Joint Pole Authorization number should begin with the Initiator's Member code and can have a maximum of 23 alpha or numeric characters only. The only exceptions are blank spaces or hyphens within the 23 maximum character count. If the Form 2 is revised, characters like RO1 or COR are not included in the maximum 23-character count for the F2 name (Revised March 2021).

18.1-A Preparation of Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization

By agreement, any Member may be designated as the constructing Member in joint work.

The Member initiating Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization shall specify its Authorization number and all required details of the agreement. The Joint Pole Authorization number shall begin with the current member's code. The Form 2 shall include, but is not limited to:

- (a) Pole Number
- (b) Nature of work
- (c) Applicable Routine Section Number
- (d) Designation of involved Members
- (e) Circuits
- (f) Interest
- (g) Grade
- (h) Space
- (i) Pole/equipment data, including jointly owned arms, anchors, risers, wireless and broadband equipment.
- (j) Other essential record data i.e. tenants, power communication (~~P. Comm~~)
- (k) Authorized Costs item number and number of items where required
- (l) Police and/or fire report or case number when applicable and available
- (m) Provide billing information when applicable billing sections are used
- (n) Estimated construction start date
- (o) Date sent
- (p) Date prepared
- (q) Pole Class for wood poles
- (r) Additional notes such as pending JPA numbers or corrections per field conditions
- (s) Pole loading analysis only for poles associated with the JPA. NOTE: (1) Members cannot dictate pole loading method and format however must meet all GO95 requirements (2) Section 4.1 refer to the section.
- (t) Optional drawing/map: highlight only the poles associated with the JPA (Revised June 2020).
- (u) GPS coordinates - When the existing SCJPC pole card does not have the GPS Coordinates, adding them to a Form 2 is preferred, but not required.

The Preliminary Form 2 shall be limited to 10 pages.

Where a specific transaction involves special agreement, it shall be designated as such on Joint Pole Authorization. (See Section 1.2)

It is the responsibility of all Members involved in the Joint Pole Authorization to see that data and details of the agreement are correct. The date Joint Pole Authorization is sent shall be used in completing the billing for structural and salvage values; except in replacements, the date poles are

FORM 50
GPS Coordinates Addition/Correction

Utility Representative Phone No. or E-Mail

To: _____ Date: _____

From: _____

No.	SCJPC Unique ID	Pole Number	Existing Latitude	New/Updated Latitude	Existing Longitude	New/Updated Longitude
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						

Approved Date: _____ Denial Date: _____

Approved By: _____ Denied By: _____

Date Sent to SCJPC: _____ Reason for Denial: _____

18.11 Form 50 – GPS Coordinates Addition/Correction

This form is used to notify the base owner of the addition/correction of a joint pole's GPS coordinates.

This form is not to be used for a pole pending on a JPA as the addition/correction is to be addressed on the pending JPA.

The form shall be sent to the base owner for review. If base owner approves the proposed GPS coordinates, the approved form will be returned to the sender and to the SCJPC for pole record update. If the base owner denies the proposed GPS coordinates, a reason will be provided, and form is to be returned to sender.

Response is to be received from base owner within 45 days.

See Example XX, page 18-XX.

ITEM 1784 ENGINEERED STEEL POLES

Engineered Steel Pole RH verbiage changes. See Red.

3.14 Notice of Intention to Construct Other than Wood Pole.

If constructing Member, to accommodate other members' requirements, is involved in expense exceeding that required for its facilities when alone, purchase of interest by Member desiring to participate in joint ownership shall be made when poles and anchors have been installed according to approved plan.

Section 1.2 required for Engineered Steel Poles (Revised January 2008). (See loading requirements and other notes in Section 15.5, for ES poles.)

7.3 Overbuild

This section provides for the replacement of a solely owned or a jointly owned pole, less than 25 years old for the sole benefit of an incoming Member or one joint owner. This section also applies to poles replaced due to damage caused by facilities of a joint owner, poles replaced due to California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) mandates directed at specific member facilities, and to all solely owned or jointly owned poles replaced for the sole benefit of Members

having less than 20 consecutive years of Joint Pole Committee membership.

The cost to benefiting Member shall include:

- (a) Equity of overbuilt Member's structural value of existing pole, less salvage
- (b) Cost of transfer
- (c) Additional material installed to comply with requirements of joint ownership
- (d) Sidewalk or pavement repairs
- (e) Entire removal cost

The sole owner, or each joint owner as appropriate, shall bill the benefiting Member for the portion of pulling and transportation it performs. The Member recovering pole shall allow salvage to other owner(s) for its relinquished interest. Member placing new pole shall bill an interest to other Members.

When a benefiting Member replaces pole and another Member desires additional grade or space, replacement shall be made in accordance with rule of the Routine relating to Section 7.11. Mutual benefit shall not apply where a non-benefiting owner is forced to increase grade or space as a result of the activities undertaken by the benefiting Member.

7.14 Replacement of Wood Pole with Other than Wood Pole.

Member replacing wood pole with other than wood pole for mutual benefit, shall sell interest in new pole to other Members concerned. Each member shall transfer at own expense, receive salvage, and pay pulling and transportation.

Mutual benefit shall be understood to apply under this section as follows:

- (a) Pole 25 years old or more
- (b) Pole less than 25 years old, but rendered unfit for service by any cause not the fault of a joint owner including existing overloaded poles. (Revised April 2015)
- (c) Pole requiring relocation for the benefit of all Members concerned
- (d) Pole identified in authorized maintenance inspection program as unfit for service

ITEM 1784 ENGINEERED STEEL POLES

- (e) Pole requiring replacement for clearing of discovered existing General Order 95 infractions not the fault of any joint owner.
- (f) Pole replaced prior to Form 2 and Form 48. Form 2 must be noted that this is a Priority Pole. Section 7.13 applies only if Form 2 is not issued within 45 days. (Revised February 2017)

For poles that are more than 25 years old, this section applies only to Members having more than 20 consecutive years of Joint Pole Committee membership.

For those Members with less than 20 consecutive years of Joint Pole Committee membership, which initiates the replacement of poles under the provisions of (a) above, Section 7.3 shall apply.

This rule shall also apply where owner failed to issue Notice of Intention for pole and incoming Member desires its replacement within three years, beginning with January 1 following date of its installation. If pole has been installed longer than the three-year period specified and is not more than 25 years old, the replacement shall be in accordance with rule of the Routine relating to Section 7.3.

Section 1.2 required for Engineered Steel Poles. (See loading requirements and other notes in Section 15.5, for ES poles.)

Note: The setting member will PTD other than wood poles.
(Revised January 2011).

15.7 Alternative To Wood Poles

CF (Composite Fiberglass – single piece)
CM (Composite Fiberglass – multi pieces)
LS (Lightweight Steel)
ES (Engineered Steel)
HS (Heavy Steel)
CP (Concrete Pole)
DI (Ductile Iron)
HD (Heavy Ductile Iron)

Notation: Engineered Steel poles require Section 1.2. Any Member setting an ES pole as a wood pole replacement that would meet CPUC Safety Factor standards is responsible for all cost above and beyond the cost to install a wood pole that would have met the minimum wood pole safety factor. Any costs above and beyond installation of the wood pole may be shared through mutual agreement by section 1.2. New ES pole setting Member's must send all other occupying Members a final set of Loading Calculations that meet GO95 safety factors as outlined in table 4 of Rule 44.1. Any Form 2 initiating an ES pole transaction (either solely or jointly) after XXXXX Month YEAR XXXX, that does not meet GO95 loading standards, requires the Base Owner to replace the ES pole as a section 7.3 replacement upon a new Member applying for ownership. Any Member interested in attaching or adding load to an ES pole may request Base Pole Owner's Engineered Steel Pole loading and specifications for their own calculations, per GO 95 Rule 44.4.

(Revised January 2008). (LS & CP revised June 2008). (DI, CM added January 2011). (HS, HD added October 2013).

Fire Mesh verbiage changes

15.5 Length, Year Set and Treatment of Pole

The length, year set and treatment of pole must be accurately given on Joint Pole Authorization as these data constitute the basis upon which price is fixed for interest in pole in accordance with schedules of structural values. For purposes of type of treatment, they shall be listed on the Joint Pole Authorization as Butt Treated (T), Full Treated (FT), Gray (G) or Additional Treatment (AT).

Types of treatment included in these groupings are as follows and these category grouping types are required information on a preliminary Form 2:

T (Butt Treated)

Creosote or Pentachlorophenol

FT (Full Treated) Creosote Pentachlorophenol Cellon - Natural
ColorChemonite

Copper Naphthenate (No Fire Mesh Wrap added.)

FTW (Full Treated with Fire Mesh Wrap added) – A pole treated with a treatment identified in the full treated pole definition with a fire-resistant intumescent wrap applied to the pole, either partial or full wrap.

G (Gray) - Stain that is applied for aesthetic reasons only. Grey stain may have been applied to any treatment type applied through the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s.

Gray Stained - Cellon Gray Stained - Chemonite

Gray Stained - Butt Treated Cedar

AT – Refers to any pole that has had a remedial treatment applied to the pole as a result of an intrusive pole inspection. This classification may be in addition to a T, FT, FTW or G pole. Treatments that have been used but are not limited to the following:

Methylisothiocyanate-MITC FUME or WoodFume

UltraFume DuraFume, SuperFume (Dazomat based treatments)

Disodium octaborate teraglydrate-Tim-borFluorod

Disodium octaborate-Boron rods

15.5-A Additional Treatment of Joint Poles

Mutual agreement must be obtained prior to additional treatment of existing joint poles. The actual Chemical used for additional treatment will be identified on the preliminary joint pole authorization.

Fire Mesh Wrap is specifically designed to withstand wildfires by adding a protective layer to the pole. When a Base Owner determines that a pole is in a High Fire Threat District area or there is just cause, Fire Mesh may be used as necessary when setting or retrofitting an existing pole. These wrapped poles shall list FTW on the preliminary joint pole authorization and AT as applicable.

Note: Intrusive Testing shall not degrade the Fire Mesh Wrap on the pole. Sound and Prod Testing of the pole will not be hampered by the wrap. Poles with this wrap can be climbed with gaffs or can have pole steps placed on it after the wrap is installed. Tears in the wrapping measuring less than < 1-inch in diameter do not need to be repaired. For Tears larger than >1-inch in diameter, the base owner shall be notified, per the 3rd Party Notification Process. For additional information regarding Fire Wrap, please see the Q&A document regarding Fire Wrap under "Pole Inspection Contacts"

and Resources” under SCE Fire Mesh Wrap Q&A document, on the SCJPC website.

Add new to the RH Glossary:

Treatment: Poles that have been fully treated from butt to top by any treatment that has been used throughout CA history, can include Penta, Cellon, Chemonite, DCOI, CCA. (The full list is large and not consistent between all IOUs and municipals.)

Fire Mesh Wrap: Wrap that is specifically designed to withstand wildfires by adding a fire protective layer to the pole. It is an intumescent (swelling up when heated) grid made of 23-gauge galvanized steel or fiberglass gridded mesh coated with a durable intumescent polymer. It is designed to protect the pole by expanding at temperatures greater than 300°F and creating a barrier that protects and shields the wooden structure from radiant heat and fire. NOTE: Poles with this wrap can be climbed with gaffs or can have pole steps placed on it after the wrap is installed. Intrusive Testing shall not degrade the Fire Mesh Wrap on the pole. Sound and Prod Testing of the pole will not be hampered by the wrap.

Sound and Prod Testing: Test conducted with a hammer and probe to detect decay pockets above ground and below ground to determine if a pole is safe to climb.

MISC: FREE ATTACHMENT DEFINITION

Free Attachments

Free attachment is defined as allowing another member to attach to an existing pole at no charge

Free Attachments apply to the following conditions;

To be used for service attachment as a direct path to a point of attachment that will serve their customer and when the Free attachment pole allows for service clearance for all GO.95 requirements. Multiple poles in close proximity the incoming member will pay to attach to the first pole attachment and the successive attachment shall be free (three pole rack)

MISC: FREE ATTACHMENT DEFINITION

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 2:42 PM
To: Anali Spencer
Subject: FREE ATTACHMENT from August 2022 meeting Fw: FOR TODAY RR AD HOC FW: [EXTERNAL] Free attachment Verbiage

From: BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2022 9:26 AM
To: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>; Maria Ortiz <MOrtiz@motiveis.com>; Bacon, John R. <John.Bacon@ladwp.com>; Kathleen Allen <kathleen@scjpc.net>
Cc: YOUNG, JOY A <jv2453@att.com>
Subject: FOR TODAY RR AD HOC FW: [EXTERNAL] Free attachment Verbiage

Sorry I forgot to send this to Angela and Maria for today.

Can we discuss this definition when we get to the item in the RR ad hoc please?

Kay Black

West ACE VP Staff – Joint Pole
2125 Occidental Road
Santa Rosa, CA 95403



From: Bacon, John R. <John.Bacon@ladwp.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2022 2:18 PM
To: BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Free attachment Verbiage

Perfect, thank you very much Kay I will make a final definition with the paragraph you provided

From: BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2022 2:07 PM
To: Bacon, John R. <John.Bacon@ladwp.com>; Kathleen Allen <kathleen@scjpc.net>
Cc: YOUNG, JOY A <jv2453@att.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Free attachment Verbiage

EXTERNAL EMAIL! This email was generated from a non-LADWP address. If any links exist, do not click/open on them unless you are 100% certain of the associated site or source. ALWAYS hover over the link to preview the actual URL/site and confirm its legitimacy.

How is this John?

New for the Glossary:

Free Attachment

Free attachments are specific to paralleling Member's leads with service conductors crossing thoroughfares directly to a premise served. Free attachment requirements are detailed in Section 11.0 and depicted in Examples A through E on Page 11-2. (A free attachment remains a Free attachment when the pole is replaced.)

Kathleen – can you confirm there is no billing when the pole is replaced? Free stays Free?

Not like an interset CLR, where the CLR member on a replacement becomes an owner.

Please let us know if I have this right. Thanks.

Kay Black

West ACE VP Staff – Joint Pole
2125 Occidental Road
Santa Rosa, CA 95403



-----Confidentiality Notice-----

This electronic message transmission contains information from the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, which may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail and delete the original message and any attachment without reading or saving in any manner.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone (909) 599-3801

October 19, 2022

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, **at 10:37 a.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:**

Ms. Maria Ortiz	XO Communications
Ms. Valerie Mitwasi	Southern California Edison
Mr. Michael Pearson	Southern California Edison
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Glenn Leckie	Frontier Communications
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Mr. Earle Carrion	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Megan LaMon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Jeremy Harmon	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Katy White	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time Warner Cable
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel Corporation/Sprint Communications CO.L. P
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Barry Consulter	AT&T California
Mr. Todd Dailey	AT&T California
Ms. Veronica Romero	AT&T California
Ms. Joy Young	AT&T California
Mr. Alvin Robielos	AT&T California
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Ms. Yvonne Johnson	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Nicholas Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Mr. Arturo Garcia	City of Glendale
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Services Inc.
Ms. Dawn Laffoon	Mobilitie, LLC
Ms. Patti Ringo	Sonic Telecom, LLC
Mr. Anthony Ghilardi	City of Pasadena
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff
Ms. Anali Spencer	Committee Staff

Ms. Ortiz called the meeting to order at 10:37 a.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Review of prior month’s meeting minutes - Ms. Ortiz opened the meeting by inquiring if there were any questions or concerns regarding the previous meeting minutes. There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 2 – Interpretation of Routine Handbook – Ms. Ortiz opened the discussion to the members for any questions regarding the Routine Handbook. There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 3 – Item 1597: Review of Routine Handbook Examples (5/19/2015) – Ms. Ortiz opened the discussion on Review of Routine Handbook Examples.

Ms. Ortiz asked if there were any other new examples that any members would like to review or discuss. There were no comments or concerns at this time.

Agenda Item 4 - Item 1783: Lat and Long on the Form 2 (from Administrative Board – 2/16/2022). – Ms. Ortiz opened to lat./long. on the Form 2. Ms. Ortiz stated this item will be in the Administrative Board Consent calendar next month.

Agenda Item 5 - Item 1784: Engineered Steel Poles (from Administrative Board – 2/16/2022). - Ms. Ortiz opened to Engineered Steel Poles. Ms. Ortiz stated this was voted on at the Administrative Board meeting today and this agenda item could be closed.

Agenda Item 6 - Item 1787: Construction Correction Process (M. Ortiz - XO Communication - 07/11/22). – Ms. Ortiz opened to Construction Correction Process. The members were to take this back and think about any ideas on how this process would work. She asked if any members had anything to discuss. Ms. Black inquired what this item was about. Ms. Ortiz stated this was the item Mr. Harmon brought up about when they receive the Form 48 and they go out to field check the conditions in the field and they do not match the proposals on the JPA. Ms. Ortiz stated this was to come up with a process on how to correct those instances. Mr. Harmon stated that they will have approved JPA’s and for whatever reason there is construction outside of grade and space which inhibits another member from completing their work. Mr. Harmon stated that they would not want to treat it as a nonconformance because it is not one until they build on the new pole and create a safety issue. He stated in that situation they are then they are contorted to following the timeframes for redirection. Mr. Harmon stated they would not want to treat it like a violation but more as a misstep on construction as opposed to treating it as a deviation. Ms. Black asked if this meant if they are the last one to transfer, but the person before them put up their facilities not where they should have. Mr. Harmon stated

that was correct and it predominantly ends up being a cell site. He stated many cell sites put up before 2007 did not have the current antennal rules and clearances. When they go to a pole with a cell site pre 2007 they do not have anywhere near the vertical clearance necessary. He stated they try their best for when a pole is reconstructed that they follow the reconstruction rules. Which is bringing it up to code and that is never easy because there are fixed features and to the extent that they get a larger pole and everyone as close as possible they will get approved grades. Many times they go out there and the facilities end up being a foot or two out of grade. That then inhibits them from putting their antenna on there because it will not be the required clearances. Mr. Harmon stated this is kind of a quality control on construction. Ms. Black asked if Mr. Harmon was looking for a process that would be expedient, basically looking for permission to be able to rearrange the party who is not placed correctly. Mr. Harmon stated that would be the ideal ability but unfortunately if it is a streetlight or a power facility hands are off and they are up to up to the other party's mercy. Mr. Harmon stated that they spend much time hammering out designs and how much they can work and the best efforts to make sure that everyone can be there and meet the new code. They will have jurisdictions asking them to get their work done but then they cannot construct and be current code because something has not been done up to par then inhibiting their work to be done. He stated it would be like a notice saying that the party's work is done but that they are out of their grade and space and then ask that they please go back and correct it. It would be like a quality control to have the contractor follow policy because it is inhibiting another company from conducting their business. He stated they are supposed to worry about their impact to the public right of way, 31.2. He stated they do not want to impair the public because they cannot complete their work. Mr. Harmon stated that something along the lines of a notice that lets the other parties know they are outside of grade and space and ask them to make the correction so that they will be able to complete their own work. Ms. Black asked if Mr. Harmon was looking for some sort of timeline to be associated, for example they "have two weeks to get back out there and fix if not" notated in the process. She asked Mr. Harmon what he would like to see. Mr. Harmon stated that unfortunately they are doing their best to get the permits to do the work within the timeframe they anticipate the poles are going to be placed at. He stated that to the extent that it causes them to extend a permit or cause additional costs for starting or contractors moving out, that they do have costs associated with not being able to perform the work. Mr. Harmon stated they do not want to go down those lines but acknowledge a need for a visit to correct or some sort of compensation for the loss that the member will be facing for having to extend permits and when the contractor goes out there and notices the issue a day of work is lost because the numbers were not matching. He stated that to the extent that there is a loss they would like to make it so they do not have that and if the other member can get out there within a week or two and correct then they probably will not need to extend their permits and roll the contractor again.

Mr. Harmon stated that it is getting more difficult to make sure they are really hitting the grades and space and he is open to finding some sort of relief or path to promoting getting in their grade and space so those type of fallout situations do not happen. Ms. Black stated that everything she has heard Mr. Harmon stated sounds completely fair, a request to the member out of grade and space to go out there in a timely manner, one to two weeks, and if they do not then that member will absorb whatever costs incurred by the member who cannot transfer like a penalty. Mr. Harmon stated that they would like to make sure that it is mutual to anyone in the same situation where if a carrier is in the wrong grade and space, they have the same obligations to go out and correct. He stated it seems that the jurisdictions seem to be more aware of utility poles in work. He stated that Verizon Wireless gets a lot more calls from jurisdictions and customers asking where things are and there are times that they would like to go out there, but they do not have the ability to do that with the way the pole has been left. Mr. Harmon stated that he could provide permits or events showing that it does create a significant loss and if they could develop some method of getting the field correction performed it would be greatly appreciated. Ms. Ortiz asked if it was something where they would create a form instead of a Form 48 or Form 7. Mr. Harmon stated something asking for construction correction with the pole number, notate the facilities are out of grade and space, and ask that they be where they need to be. Ms. Ortiz asked Mr. Harmon if he would like to create the form. Mr. Harmon agreed that he would be the one. Mr. Van Stryk asked what happens if they do not require the form because there have been times that he has sent out forms to communication companies in particular, and nothing comes back for years and they end up calling the representative and ask what happened three years ago when the form was sent to get informed they cannot move it because someone else is in their way. Mr. Harmon stated that was a good point. Mr. Harmon stated to the extent that there are facilities not built per the proposal it does have effects down the line and a real time effect. He stated he will take the action item to create a form that would allow one member to notice another member in regards to a field construction correction needed for being outside of grade and space. Ms. Ortiz stated then after they can come up with something as far as consequences go. Mr. Van Stryk stated that not just outside of grade and space but a conflict arising from it. Mr. Harmon stated that was a good point that maybe the grade and space is sufficient on the pole but there was an oversight and now there is a midspan issue and there is a need to mitigate the midspan issue and find a way to work it out. Ms. Ortiz asked if there were any other comments or concerns. There were no further comments or concerns at this time.

Agenda Item 7 – Miscellaneous Issues –

- **Fire Mesh verbiage Sec 15. 5 (3/16/2022):** Ms. Ortiz opened to the proposed verbiage for Section 15.5 for Fire Mesh. She

stated this was voted on today and that they could remove the bullet.

- **Adding the definition of Free Attachment** in the Routine Handbook from SCJPC Office (4/13/2022) - Ms. Ortiz opened to adding the definition of Free Attachment to the Routine Handbook. Ms. Black stated that there was progress made together with Mr. Harmon and Mr. Bacon. Ms. Black stated she sent the proposed new verbiage to Ms. Pranata (see attached). Ms. Black stated that all the information would be new to the routine and the red was what was just newly added that day. She stated she tried to capture what Mr. Harmon was portraying about still needing to travel multiple poles. Ms. Black stated because she did not know what a Clearance Drop was, she added the definition so it could go into the glossary. She stated it would not be associated with a clearance pole but that it is also a free attachment. Ms. Black asked if all the members were covered and if there were any comments or concerns. Mr. Harmon stated what this gets down to is that a Free Attachment can be on a clearance pole, a service pole, even a meter pole, which is how he reads it. Mr. Van Stryk asked if they would be putting Clear 23 on a clearance drop or if they would be putting free. Ms. Black stated no. Mr. Harmon stated that they could back it up and remove the Clearance drop and just understand that a Free Attachment could be technically anything. He asked if the members were stating that a service drop qualifies as a free attachment or if they could put a light on there and call it a free attachment. Mr. Van Stryk stated that a free attachment is supposed to travel one span and end at someone's premise and is not supposed to travel down multiple streets, blocks, etc. Mr. Harmon stated that a service drop goes from the pole to the person's span, house, structure, or meter. A service drop may have to cover a distance that would require clearance poles that would bring it back to the main line. He stated that only reason they would have that number of free attachments on either clearance poles, service poles, or meter poles is to serve the end customer because there is mutual benefit a lot of the times in doing that or crossing the road. Mr. Harmon stated that there are other times where a carrier would set a pole and ask for a service drop and give a free attachment which facilitates a different type of clearance, so a service and a secondary are two different types of clearances and that allows a lot of band with regards to design. He stated that he thinks a free attachment as long as it is allowed on a clearance pole, a service pole, a meter pole, a drop pole, or the owner's pole. He stated he did not want it limited in a framework that may not

be applicable to the real world. He stated that it is two parties that must agree, one to give the Free Attachment and the other to accept it and as long as there was no limitations on two members mutually agreeing on a Free Attachment. Mr. Treepaisan stated that he thinks the mutually agreeing statement covers Mr. Harmon's concerns. Ms. Black asked how does the pole record know it was mutually agreed upon. Ms. Black stated that is what she would like to do is find how they would memorialize that agreement. Ms. Black asked how a Free Attachment was notated on a pole card. Ms. Ortiz stated it is notated as FA25 or FA24 wherever they are located at. Ms. Black asked the members if she should add that to the verbiage that it is associated as FA on pole cards. Ms. Black stated that when Mr. Van Stryk brought up CLR that is what she wants to get away from because that's a clearance pole which is when a member needs to place a clearance pole their expense, the other members are attached as a CLR on the pole card which is completely different from a Free Attachment because when a pole is replaced she stated that she believes the ones that are CLR pay for the replacement and become owners. Ms. Ortiz stated that they only become owners if they need additional footage but if they remain with only the existing attachment, they can be CLR on the new pole. Ms. Black stated that maybe they need to define both to help with any confusion. Ms. Black stated she will take this back again and send the revision to Mr. Harmon, Mr. Bacon, & Ms. Ortiz. Mr. Harmon asked if there is a CLR designation next to certain attachments already on there or if they are proposing that. Ms. Black stated that when someone places a Clearance Pole that is at their expense, but the other members that are in between the pole lead they get placed with CLR on the pole card because they did not have an expense and they are now a Clearance. Ms. Ortiz stated yes, an inter-set pole. Mr. Harmon stated that sounds like a Clearance pole placed but for everyone's benefit and there is no Free Attachment. Ms. Black stated that when an inter-set pole is placed at someone's expense it is because they are the only ones that need it. She stated for example a power company that needs to take a loading off, so they place an inter-set pole for their benefit. She stated then when the other members within the lead are placed at their height of attachment, they have a CLR after them on the pole card and they do not need to share in the cost of that new inter-set pole. Mr. Van Stryk stated that the best example is a platform which are fifteen feet apart typically and it is a pole structure that carries a transformer that is too large to be held on one pole

which is solely for a power company and there is no reason why a communication company would need a pole right next to another one. He stated when the second pole when installed to serve would be a clearance attachment just so it does not rub against the pole, and they just want it to be fastened right underneath the platform. Ms. Black stated she will bring it back and they can review it at next month's Routine Revision meeting.

- **Example 33 Revision:** Ms. Ortiz stated that she did make the revision to Example 33 to make it a little clearer (see attached). Ms. Ortiz stated that on number three what was clarified that when the Clearance attachment is now needing additional footage on the new pole therefore, they are no longer clearance but now a joint owner. Ms. Ortiz stated that instead of showing CLR they are now showing grade and space and are going to become a joint owner. Ms. Black asked how U1 replacing the pole know that U2 needed more footage. Ms. Black asked if that came on the redline of the Form 2. Ms. Ortiz stated normally it did where U1 would send out the regular pole replacement and U2 would go back and redline it saying they need additional footage. Ms. Black asked if there were any questions or corrections needed from the members. There were no comments or concerns from the members. Ms. Ortiz asked if this would go to the Administrative Board to be voted on. Ms. Pranata asked if they would like to wait for the other items pending. Ms. Ortiz asked if they would like to keep it together with Free Attachment or keep it separate. Ms. Black stated that she was going to work on the verbiage to try and redefine Free Attachment and Clearance Attachment and if they could just move it all together.
- **Nonconformance/Form 11** - Ms. Ortiz opened to Nonconformance/Form 11 for Ms. Mitwasi. Ms. Mitwasi did two versions based off of the discussions they were having in the Compliance meeting and making the Form 11 match those pieces. (see attached). Ms. Mitwasi stated that she put two options to the traditional form they already had and added the text in red, which her idea was to put those into a dropdown. She stated it would have more specific details that would be drop downs as well such as high fire threats, location it is on the pole if it is in transmission or the comm space, the problem statement, and the action that would be needed. The idea of having it on Excel would be so that it is easily extracted if anybody wanted to do any reporting to it. Ms. Mitwasi stated the other option which are just examples for LADWP and Verizon Wireless (see attached). She stated that if they get multiple notifications on it, it is more of a horizontal format, and they could put multiple notifications

on one spreadsheet versus sending out individual forms. She stated these would be drop downs and for contact information it would be manual entry. She stated she understands they all have their own tracking and notification systems that they use. Ms. Mitwasi stated that the conformance side of the actual pole details has the lat./long. location description. She stated that the High Fire, Location of Infraction, Component, Condition, and Action Needed/Action were also drop downs. She stated that for problem statements there was not a drop down, but she would like to make it one if the members could come to standard problem statements that are seen to list. Ms. Mitwasi asked the members for thoughts and input and asked if they would like both or to have only one. She stated she understands they all have their individual forms, and this was just making sure that the Form 11 matches what they were outlining and defining in Compliance. Mr. Harmon stated that the current Form 11 provides basic information like the pole, the location identification and potentially the condition which was generally intended on satisfying the code. He stated which is reporting of nonconformance's and or safety hazards as discovered when inspections are being performed. Mr. Harmon stated that he would strongly lean to keeping that as a requirement as to the extent that a party wants to go into significant detail it is up to the reporting party, but with regards to requirements, he would only push the requirement of the notification of the location, the potential nonconformance and the party that needs to remediate it. Ms. Mitwasi stated she was just matching it to what the members in Compliance were discussing and asking for more detailed information. Ms. Black stated that she did not see that in the packet, and it was the first time she was seeing it. She stated that there is a GO95 work group at AT&T California that would need to look at in and give their feedback if possible. She asked if this could be left in the ad hoc and then Ms. Pranata could send it out. Ms. Ortiz asked for the Form to be sent to the members to be reviewed internally and then the members are to come back with feedback at next month's Routine Revision meeting.

- **Steel Stubbing** - Ms. Ortiz opened to Steel Stubbing from Mr. Armstrong. Ms. Black was going to revise the section for steel stubbing (see attached). Ms. Black stated that that her team did not realize that the timeframe that a steel stub would be used for was already listed. She stated her boss asked if they could take it from three years to five, so it meets the inspection timelines and that basically everything else is done in a five-year

increment. Ms. Mitwasi stated that she would need to take this back to SCE's technical resources for input. Ms. Ortiz stated that the members are to review internally and come back with feedback at next month's Routine Revision meeting.

- **Establish a Record JPA Alert Draft** - Ms. Ortiz opened to Establishing a Record JPA Alert draft (see attached). Mr. Bacon asked if there is a limit on a JPA that has a lot of no tags mostly because of covid the mapping were not available. Mr. Bacon asked if there is a limit on how many no tags on a JPA would be permissible. Ms. Black stated it was zero because they are not allowed, and they do not want to allow them. She stated that the base owner is responsible for identifying and retagging the no tag in the field. Ms. Black stated there is about a fifteen-day due date on that and sometimes AT&T California is slow in getting out that information which they could always escalate that to herself. She stated that the base owner is supposed to identify that pole with the tag and there should never be a not tag that gets final billed. Ms. LaFrenais stated she was unsure if they would always be able to send year set because the person who is looking for the pole information is doing their due diligence in looking at old maps but there may not be a button on the pole that says the year that it was set, and it may be hard to always get. Ms. Ortiz asked Ms. Allen if it was required for the pole records. Ms. Allen stated the year set was required for the pole record and without, it would be returned because the system will not take it. Ms. Ortiz stated that Bear Valley may need to provide their best guess that all joint members on the pole would agree to. Ms. LaFrenais agreed it would be the best guess. Mr. Bacon stated he would take this time to inform the members that LADWP is planning to offer the computer for their mapping and is waiting approval within the next couple of weeks. He stated that there are a lot of companies that need pole tag information and all the information for their make readies or JPAs. He stated LADWP will be opening up their doors again for members to be able to go over and look at their mapping. Ms. Ortiz asked if that meant they will no longer be able to request it via email anymore. Mr. Bacon stated that is what he hopes and that all day every day the room will be available from 7:30 am to 3:00 pm and if they cannot find it on their database then the request can be sent via email. He stated they are hoping it eliminates having one person they have answering outside members inquiries for pole tags, conductor sizes, and everything else that goes with the make ready. Mr. Bacon stated he will send out a blast email when LADWP gets the computer and clearance from security. Ms. Ortiz asked on the *JPA Alert* if there were any

corrections or changes or if the members were ok with posting the alert. There were no comments or concerns from the members. Ms. Ortiz stated that the *JPA Alert* was ready for Ms. Pranata to post.

- Ms. Pranata asked Ms. Ortiz if they are ready to talk about the Intent. Ms. Ortiz stated that Ms. Pranata sent her an email about what an Intent is. Ms. Ortiz stated that some of the members know what an Intent is because it is used in the North and she stated that members are adding it to SCJPC finals being submitted which in the SCJPC they are not familiar with that term. Ms. Pranata was suggesting adding it to the glossary that the Intent is a Preliminary Form 2 and asked the members how they felt about that. Ms. Black stated that the SCJPC should not be seeing Intent associated with anything that is coming over as a final bill. Ms. Allen was going to ask because with that definition it does not refer to the final that the SCJPC receives. Ms. Black replied that it does not refer to the final and stated that an intent is only 45 days. Ms. Allen stated that they are seeing on the JPAs no cost for the entire Intent. Ms. Allen stated it is possible that members may be thinking that Intent means Final. Ms. Black stated that if it was AT&T California to send it to her. Ms. Pranata and Ms. Allen stated it was not AT&T California. Ms. Pranata stated they know it means Form 2 but it was not anywhere in the Routine Handbook. Ms. Allen asked if for the SCJPC they should not accept the note no cost for the Intent because Intent means preliminary. Ms. Black stated that was correct and it should say no cost for Final Bill. Ms. Pranata stated the company will be notified and hopefully they will change it moving forward. Ms. Ortiz asked if they still needed to add it to the glossary or if it was ok just in the minutes that an Intent is a Preliminary Form 2. Ms. Pranata asked to verify that moving forward the SCJPC should not accept if notated no charge for the whole Intent. Ms. Mitwasi asked how it impact from a billing perspective. Ms. Pranata stated they could return it back as a memo. Ms. Ortiz stated that there is no financial impact on the terms. Ms. Pranata stated that if the cost is for the whole intent, then the other member would get no charges and it would be a zero amount JPA. If there is no note, then the prices will be added per usual. Ms. Black stated because of the confusion it should be returned to have the verbiage changed to one that there is no confusion otherwise the Final Bill will be memorialized on the website. Ms. Ortiz stated that down the line if another member pulls up that Final, they may think that is the proper way to word it and start doing it that way as well. Mr. Bacon asked what the

best solution for the SCJPC for processing would be. Ms. Black stated that it would be to send the JPA back and ask that the word Intent be changed to either JPA or Final Bill. Ms. Pranata stated that is what they will do.

Ms. Ortiz asked if there were any other miscellaneous items. There were no further comments or concerns from the members.

Agenda Item 8 – Review of Action items/JPA Alerts –

- Mr. Harmon will work on a Form for the Construction Correction Process and the members will continue on how to proceed if there is no response received.
- Ms. Black is to make additional revisions to the Free Attachment definition.
- Ms. Pranata will send out the revised Form 11 to all the members. The members are to review internally and come back with feedback next month.
- Ms. Black will make revisions to Section 19.7 for Steel Stubbing. The members are to review internally and come back with feedback next month.
- Ms. Pranata will post the *JPA Alert* regarding establishing a record.

The Meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m. until November 16, 2022.

Anali Spencer – Committee Staff

**PRELIMINARY JOINT POLE AUTHORIZATION
ADDING GPS COORDINATES TO POLE LOCATIONS
EXAMPLE xx**

- (1) This transaction shows how to add GPS coordinates for a pole location.

Use WGS84 formatting, with 6 to 8 digits, and place under the Section 15.4 pole location address. (8 digits is most accurate.)

- (2) When the pole is replaced, it will move one foot on the address line, but using the same GPS coordinates is ok.

NOTE: When the existing SCJPC pole card does not have the GPS Coordinates, adding them to a Form 2 is preferred, but not required and should not be a reason for denial.

Date
Prepared 4/14/2022

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

Date
Sent 4/16/2022Confirming
AgreementIn
Field ☐By
Telephone ☐Est.
Const.
StartNo. of
Pages 1J.P.
Auth.No.

U3-123-456

UTILITY	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT-DIVISION-EXCHANGE	APPROVED	TAXING INSTRUCTIONS	ACCOUNTING DATA
U1	JONES	LOS ANGELES	JONES	LOS ANGELES	5577303
U2	JOHNSON	LOS ANGELES	JOHNSON	LOS ANGELES	A403
U3	SMITH	LOS ANGELES	SMITH	LOS ANGELES	12345

POLE NO.	Pole Length Anchor Size	Year Set	Pole Trt	Record				Proposed					Item No.	LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK If not in accordance with Joint Pole agreement and routine-state reasons.
			Class											
			Anchor Direct.	U1	U2	U3		U1	U2	U3				
				L				L						U1 TO REPLACE POLE FOR BENEFIT OF U3 SEC 7.3, 10.8 1
1234U1	45	02	FT	39-9	23-5	24-1		PTD						DREAM RD S/S 212' W/O ONE WAY 2
			CL-3											33.881958, -118.274545 1 3
								1	1			83		U3 TO PAY U1 & U2 FOR TRANSFER 4
														5
5678U1	50	14	FT					43-13	23-5	24-1				DREAM RD S/S 211' W/O ONE WAY 6
														33.881958, -118.274545 2 7
														8
														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

NEVERLAND
COMMUNITY

VP/J.P.-03

Rev. Jul 2013

New section. 15.4- B GPS Coordinates

The GPS Coordinates, when known, can be listed under the 15.4 Pole Location Address on the LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK side of the Form 2. The coordinates should be 6 to 8 digits (8 being most accurate) and be formatted to WGS84 standard. When the existing SCJPC pole card does not have the GPS Coordinates, adding them to a Form 2 is preferred, but not required and should not be a reason for denial. See Example xx in Section 18, page 18-xx.

Under Section 18.1 A – add red below

RECORD FORMS

18.0 Record Forms

The forms used for expediting joint pole work and recording transactions are listed below:

Form #	Form Name
2-1	Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization
2-2	Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization
2-1 FINAL	Final Joint Pole Authorization
2-2 FINAL	Final Joint Pole Authorization
Form 7	Joint Pole Memorandum
Form 9	Joint Pole Riser Notification
Form 11	Notice of GO 95 Non-Conformance
Form 12	Pole Record
Form 16	Reallocation of Space
Form 44	Bill of Sale
Form 48	Notice of Work Completed
Form 49	Tracer

Hard or soft copies shall be provided as agreed by the parties.

(Revised January 2015)

18.1 Form 2 - Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization

Any agreement to undertake joint work must be confirmed in writing by using this form. This is authority to undertake joint work as specified. Member initiating transaction shall make necessary copies for each Member involved, all of which must be approved by an authorized representative of each involved Member. Approval may be by signature of the authorized representative to be shown on the forms in the space provided, or by the authorized representative's name, followed by the written initials of a delegated representative confirming the agreement. Names of representatives effecting agreement must be specified in space provided. Members that have various designated District, Division, or Exchange areas should identify the appropriate area by name. The Joint Pole Authorization number is assigned by the issuing Member. The Joint Pole Authorization number should begin with the Initiator's Member code and can have a maximum of 23 alpha or numeric characters only. The only exceptions are blank spaces or hyphens within the 23 maximum character count. If the Form 2 is revised, characters like RO1 or COR are not included in the maximum 23-character count for the F2 name (Revised March 2021).

18.1-A Preparation of Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization

By agreement, any Member may be designated as the constructing Member in joint work.

The Member initiating Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization shall specify its Authorization number and all required details of the agreement. The Joint Pole Authorization number shall begin with the current member's code. The Form 2 shall include, but is not limited to:

- (a) Pole Number
- (b) Nature of work
- (c) Applicable Routine Section Number
- (d) Designation of involved Members
- (e) Circuits
- (f) Interest
- (g) Grade
- (h) Space
- (i) Pole/equipment data, including jointly owned arms, anchors, risers, wireless and broadband equipment.
- (j) Other essential record data i.e. tenants, power communication (~~P. Comm~~)
- (k) Authorized Costs item number and number of items where required
- (l) Police and/or fire report or case number when applicable and available
- (m) Provide billing information when applicable billing sections are used
- (n) Estimated construction start date
- (o) Date sent
- (p) Date prepared
- (q) Pole Class for wood poles
- (r) Additional notes such as pending JPA numbers or corrections per field conditions
- (s) Pole loading analysis only for poles associated with the JPA. NOTE: (1) Members cannot dictate pole loading method and format however must meet all GO95 requirements (2) Section 4.1 refer to the section.
- (t) Optional drawing/map: highlight only the poles associated with the JPA (Revised June 2020).
- (u) GPS coordinates - When the existing SCJPC pole card does not have the GPS Coordinates, adding them to a Form 2 is preferred, but not required.

The Preliminary Form 2 shall be limited to 10 pages.

Where a specific transaction involves special agreement, it shall be designated as such on Joint Pole Authorization. (See Section 1.2)

It is the responsibility of all Members involved in the Joint Pole Authorization to see that data and details of the agreement are correct. The date Joint Pole Authorization is sent shall be used in completing the billing for structural and salvage values; except in replacements, the date poles are

ITEM 1784 ENGINEERED STEEL POLES

Engineered Steel Pole RH verbiage changes. See Red.

3.14 Notice of Intention to Construct Other than Wood Pole.

If constructing Member, to accommodate other members' requirements, is involved in expense exceeding that required for its facilities when alone, purchase of interest by Member desiring to participate in joint ownership shall be made when poles and anchors have been installed according to approved plan.

Section 1.2 required for Engineered Steel Poles (Revised January 2008). (See loading requirements and other notes in Section 15.7, for ES poles.)

7.3 Overbuild

This section provides for the replacement of a solely owned or a jointly owned pole, less than 25 years old for the sole benefit of an incoming Member or one joint owner. This section also applies to poles replaced due to damage caused by facilities of a joint owner, poles replaced due to California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) mandates directed at specific member facilities, and to all solely owned or jointly owned poles replaced for the sole benefit of Members

having less than 20 consecutive years of Joint Pole Committee membership.

The cost to benefiting Member shall include:

- (a) Equity of overbuilt Member's structural value of existing pole, less salvage
- (b) Cost of transfer
- (c) Additional material installed to comply with requirements of joint ownership
- (d) Sidewalk or pavement repairs
- (e) Entire removal cost

The sole owner, or each joint owner as appropriate, shall bill the benefiting Member for the portion of pulling and transportation it performs. The Member recovering pole shall allow salvage to other owner(s) for its relinquished interest. Member placing new pole shall bill an interest to other Members.

When a benefiting Member replaces pole and another Member desires additional grade or space, replacement shall be made in accordance with rule of the Routine relating to Section 7.11. Mutual benefit shall not apply where a non-benefiting owner is forced to increase grade or space as a result of the activities undertaken by the benefiting Member.

7.14 Replacement of Wood Pole with Other than Wood Pole.

Member replacing wood pole with other than wood pole for mutual benefit, shall sell interest in new pole to other Members concerned. Each member shall transfer at own expense, receive salvage, and pay pulling and transportation.

Mutual benefit shall be understood to apply under this section as follows:

- (a) Pole 25 years old or more
- (b) Pole less than 25 years old, but rendered unfit for service by any cause not the fault of a joint owner including existing overloaded poles. (Revised April 2015)
- (c) Pole requiring relocation for the benefit of all Members concerned
- (d) Pole identified in authorized maintenance inspection program as unfit for service

ITEM 1784 ENGINEERED STEEL POLES

- (e) Pole requiring replacement for clearing of discovered existing General Order 95 infractions not the fault of any joint owner.
- (f) Pole replaced prior to Form 2 and Form 48. Form 2 must be noted that this is a Priority Pole. Section 7.13 applies only if Form 2 is not issued within 45 days. (Revised February 2017)

For poles that are more than 25 years old, this section applies only to Members having more than 20 consecutive years of Joint Pole Committee membership.

For those Members with less than 20 consecutive years of Joint Pole Committee membership, which initiates the replacement of poles under the provisions of (a) above, Section 7.3 shall apply.

This rule shall also apply where owner failed to issue Notice of Intention for pole and incoming Member desires its replacement within three years, beginning with January 1 following date of its installation. If pole has been installed longer than the three-year period specified and is not more than 25 years old, the replacement shall be in accordance with rule of the Routine relating to Section 7.3.

Section 1.2 required for Engineered Steel Poles. (See loading requirements and other notes in Section 15.7, for ES poles.)

Note: The setting member will PTD other than wood poles.
(Revised January 2011).

15.7 Alternative To Wood Poles

CF (Composite Fiberglass – single piece)

CM (Composite Fiberglass – multi pieces)

LS (Lightweight Steel)

ES (Engineered Steel)

HS (Heavy Steel)

CP (Concrete Pole)

DI (Ductile Iron)

HD (Heavy Ductile Iron)

Notation: Engineered Steel poles require Section 1.2. Any Member setting an ES pole as a wood pole replacement that would meet CPUC Safety Factor standards is responsible for all cost above and beyond the cost to install a wood pole that would have met the minimum wood pole safety factor. Any costs above and beyond installation of the wood pole may be shared through mutual agreement by section 1.2. New ES pole setting Member's must send all other occupying Members a final set of Loading Calculations that meet GO95 safety factors as outlined in table 4 of Rule 44.1. Any Form 2 initiating an ES pole transaction (either solely or jointly) after XXXXX Month YEAR XXXX, that does not meet GO95 loading standards, requires the Base Owner to replace the ES pole as a section 7.3 replacement upon a new Member applying for ownership. Any Member interested in attaching or adding load to an ES pole may request Base Pole Owner's Engineered Steel Pole loading and specifications for their own calculations, per GO 95 Rule 44.4.

(Revised January 2008). (LS & CP revised June 2008). (DI, CM added January 2011). (HS, HD added October 2013).

Fire Mesh verbiage changes

15.5 Length, Year Set and Treatment of Pole

The length, year set and treatment of pole must be accurately given on Joint Pole Authorization as these data constitute the basis upon which price is fixed for interest in pole in accordance with schedules of structural values. For purposes of type of treatment, they shall be listed on the Joint Pole Authorization as Butt Treated (T), Full Treated (FT), Gray (G) or Additional Treatment (AT).

Types of treatment included in these groupings are as follows and these category grouping types are required information on a preliminary Form 2:

T (Butt Treated)

Creosote or Pentachlorophenol

FT (Full Treated) Creosote Pentachlorophenol Cellon - Natural
ColorChemonite

Copper Naphthenate (No Fire Mesh Wrap added.)

FTW (Full Treated with Fire Mesh Wrap added) – A pole treated with a treatment identified in the full treated pole definition with a fire-resistant intumescent wrap applied to the pole, either partial or full wrap.

G (Gray) - Stain that is applied for aesthetic reasons only. Grey stain may have been applied to any treatment type applied through the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s.

Gray Stained - Cellon Gray Stained - Chemonite

Gray Stained - Butt Treated Cedar

AT – Refers to any pole that has had a remedial treatment applied to the pole as a result of an intrusive pole inspection. This classification may be in addition to a T, FT, FTW or G pole. Treatments that have been used but are not limited to the following:

Methylisothiocyanate-MITC FUME or WoodFume

UltraFume DuraFume, SuperFume (Dazomat based treatments)

Disodium octaborate teraglydrate-Tim-borFluorod

Disodium octaborate-Boron rods

15.5-A Additional Treatment of Joint Poles

Mutual agreement must be obtained prior to additional treatment of existing joint poles. The actual Chemical used for additional treatment will be identified on the preliminary joint pole authorization.

Fire Mesh Wrap is specifically designed to withstand wildfires by adding a protective layer to the pole. When a Base Owner determines that a pole is in a High Fire Threat District area or there is just cause, Fire Mesh may be used as necessary when setting or retrofitting an existing pole. These wrapped poles shall list FTW on the preliminary joint pole authorization and AT as applicable.

Note: Intrusive Testing shall not degrade the Fire Mesh Wrap on the pole. Sound and Prod Testing of the pole will not be hampered by the wrap. Poles with this wrap can be climbed with gaffs or can have pole steps placed on it after the wrap is installed. Tears in the wrapping measuring less than < 1-inch in diameter do not need to be repaired. For Tears larger than >1-inch in diameter, the base owner shall be notified, per the 3rd Party Notification Process. For additional information regarding Fire Wrap, please see the Q&A document regarding Fire Wrap under "Pole Inspection Contacts"

and Resources” under SCE Fire Mesh Wrap Q&A document, on the SCJPC website.

Add new to the RH Glossary:

Treatment: Poles that have been fully treated from butt to top by any treatment that has been used throughout CA history, can include Penta, Cellon, Chemonite, DCOI, CCA. (The full list is large and not consistent between all IOUs and municipals.)

Fire Mesh Wrap: Wrap that is specifically designed to withstand wildfires by adding a fire protective layer to the pole. It is an intumescent (swelling up when heated) grid made of 23-gauge galvanized steel or fiberglass gridded mesh coated with a durable intumescent polymer. It is designed to protect the pole by expanding at temperatures greater than 300°F and creating a barrier that protects and shields the wooden structure from radiant heat and fire. NOTE: Poles with this wrap can be climbed with gaffs or can have pole steps placed on it after the wrap is installed. Intrusive Testing shall not degrade the Fire Mesh Wrap on the pole. Sound and Prod Testing of the pole will not be hampered by the wrap.

Sound and Prod Testing: Test conducted with a hammer and probe to detect decay pockets above ground and below ground to determine if a pole is safe to climb.

MISC: FREE ATTACHMENT DEFINITION

Free Attachment verbiage for glossary

Free Attachment

Free attachments are specific to paralleling Member's leads with service conductors crossing thoroughfares directly to a premise served. Service drops that qualify as a Free Attachment do not have a Messenger and travel only one pole span. Free attachment requirements are detailed in Section 11.0 and depicted in Examples A and C on Page 11-2. (A free attachment remains a Free attachment when the pole is replaced.)

MISC: STEEL STUBBING - SECTION 19.7

19.7 Reinforcement of Poles Changes in red

Poles may be reinforced with steel sleeve, fiberglass wrap, stubs/trussing, mod/poles, etc. by mutual agreement with other owners of record.

(See Authorized Costs Items 6, 17 or 18)

The reinforcing Member is responsible for placing the pole tag as specified by good construction standards, as well as for miscellaneous hardware, i.e., visibility strips, pole steps, etc.

Other items which may be associated with the reinforcement process, such as asphalt or concrete repairs (see Section 19.6), shall be shared equally with all owners.

The added labor cost to the base cost of reinforcement resulting from risers or other facilities which increase the labor cost shall be borne by the owner of such facilities.

It is not the intent of this rule to prohibit reinforcing in emergencies where advance approval cannot be obtained.

If replacement of reinforced pole is desired by one joint owner within ~~three~~ five years, beginning with January 1 following date of the reinforcement, this owner shall reimburse the other owner(s) for its proportion of the original reinforcement costs.

Where joint owners agree to replace reinforced pole for mutual benefit, the reimbursement shall not apply. In all cases, pulling, transporting, and disposing shall be a joint expense and shall apply to pole only. (Refer to Section 2.7D)

Question to the Members; How is the stub disposed of?

**PRELIMINARY JOINT POLE AUTHORIZATION
REMOVAL & REPLACEMENT OF AN INTERSET POLE
EXAMPLE 33**

(1) The first transaction shows U2 to remove (or removing) their clearance attachment from pole.

(2) The second transaction shows U1 replacing the pole. U2 will maintain clearance attachment on the new pole.

(3) The third transaction shows U1 replacing the pole. For this transaction, U2 will need additional footage on the new pole. Due to the additional footage, U2 will no longer qualify as a clearance attachment, U2 will be a joint owner on the new pole.

Glossary

Intent – Preliminary Form 2

JPA Alert

Joint pole with no existing joint pole record

In the case that a joint pole has been found in the field, but a joint pole record is not found on SCJPC website or database, a record can be created if:

- 1) Extensive research has been completed and it has been confirmed by attached members that there is no existing record for a pole at the same location.
- 2) There is no pending JPA to create the record for said pole.
- 3) All parties attached to the pole agree that the pole is jointly owned.

If all above criteria is met, the following information is to be sent to SCJPC to create the record.

- 1) Agreement from all parties attached to the pole confirming that the pole is jointly owned.
- 2) Pole record information
 - a. Pole number
 - b. Height
 - c. Year set
 - d. Treatment
 - e. Location
 - f. City
 - g. Owners with grade and space

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Tuesday, November 1, 2022 4:08 PM
To: Anali Spencer
Subject: Fw: [EXTERNAL] RE: Free Attachment

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee
909-599-3801 x8
Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:37 AM
To: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] RE: Free Attachment

Free Attachment verbiage for glossary

Free Attachment

Free attachments are specific to paralleling Member's leads with service conductors crossing thoroughfares directly to a premise served. Service drops that qualify as a Free Attachment do not have a Messenger and **usually** travels only one pole span. **When free attachments travel multiple spans it is because a clearance drop is required to reach multiple premises being served off the free attachment.** Free attachment requirements are detailed in Section 11.0 and depicted in Examples A and C on Page 11-2. (A free attachment remains a Free attachment when the pole is replaced.

Clearance Drop verbiage for glossary

Clearance Drop

A clearance drop is defined as being a free attachment that is needed to reach a multiple premise locations that will be served from the free attachment. These facilities have no messengers. A clearance drop is not to be confused with a clearance pole.

Kay Black

West ACE VP Staff – Joint Pole
2125 Occidental Road
Santa Rosa, CA 95403



From: Bacon, John R. <John.Bacon@ladwp.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:15 AM
To: Jeremy Harmon <JHarmon@motiveis.com>; BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>
Cc: Maria Ortiz <MOrtiz@motiveis.com>; YOUNG, JOY A <jv2453@att.com>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: Free Attachment

Awesome,

Thank you,

From: Jeremy Harmon <JHarmon@motiveis.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:11 AM
To: BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>; Bacon, John R. <John.Bacon@ladwp.com>
Cc: Maria Ortiz <MOrtiz@motiveis.com>; YOUNG, JOY A <jv2453@att.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Free Attachment

EXTERNAL EMAIL! This email was generated from a non-LADWP address. If any links exist, do not click/open on them unless you are 100% certain of the associated site or source. ALWAYS hover over the link to preview the actual URL/site and confirm its legitimacy.

Wow. I am seriously impressed! Did you record me? I could not have written it better.... BTW here is the Definition of a Clearance pole:

Rule 22.6-F

F. Service/Clearance Pole means a pole, required only to maintain above-ground clearances for service drops or to maintain service drop span limitations. Permissible attachments are limited to 0 - 750 volt conductors, supply service drops, associated risers and runs, communication facilities, lighting and its associated equipment, and guys.



Jeremy Harmon | Regulatory Manager Field Operations

P 818-898-2352 | C (818) 497-1297



9275 Corbin Ave., Northridge, CA, 91324 | motiveis.com

From: BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:07 AM
To: Jeremy Harmon <JHarmon@motiveis.com>; Bacon, John R. <John.Bacon@ladwp.com>
Cc: Maria Ortiz <MOrtiz@motiveis.com>; YOUNG, JOY A <jv2453@att.com>
Subject: Free Attachment

Hi Jeremy,

Can you please define a “clearance drop” for me? Is what I wrote below ok? I tried to capture what you said.....I think it needs help!!! Edit away please!

Free Attachment verbiage for glossary

Free Attachment

Free attachments are specific to paralleling Member's leads with service conductors crossing thoroughfares directly to a premise served. Service drops that qualify as a Free Attachment do not have a Messenger and **usually** travels only one pole span. **When free attachments travel multiple spans it is because a clearance drop is required to reach multiple premises being served off the free attachment.** Free attachment requirements are detailed in Section 11.0 and depicted in Examples A and C on Page 11-2. (A free attachment remains a Free attachment when the pole is replaced.

Clearance Drop verbiage for glossary

Clearance Drop

A clearance drop is defined as being a free attachment that is needed to reach a multiple premise locations that will be served from the free attachment. These facilities have no messengers. A clearance drop is not to be confused with a clearance pole.

Kay Black

West ACE VP Staff – Joint Pole
2125 Occidental Road
Santa Rosa, CA 95403



Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

-----Confidentiality Notice-----

This electronic message transmission contains information from the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, which may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail and delete the original message and any attachment without reading or saving in any manner.

MISC: NONCONFORMANCE/FORM 11

G.O. 95 Non-Conformance Notification																							
REPORTING MEMBER INFORMATION						INFRACTING MEMBER INFORMATION				INFRACTION INFORMATION (One line per infraction)													
Reporting Member Name/Code:	Member Renter (if applicable):	Identified By (Last Name, First Name):	E-mail:	Contact Phone:	Date Identified:	Notification/Tracking Number:	Infractioning Member Name/Code:	E-mail:	Contact Phone No.:	Pole Number:	Latitude:	Longitude:	Location Description:	City (Provide Full Name):	Zip Code:	High Fire Threat:	Location of Insfraction on Pole, Select Elevation:	Problem Statement:	Component:	Condition:	Action Needed/Task Action Description:	Additional Comments:	(Pending) Photos:
(E) Southern California Edison	N/A	Walker, Paul/DDI	tpnoinbox@sce.com	N-P	7/17/22	406266262 Verizon		tsmith@verizon.com		2015675	34.168418	-117.31768	SHERIDA RD 308' W/O MORGAN RD	REDLANDS	92373	High Fire	Communication	CIP DAMAGE COMM GUY POLE	Guy	Damaged_Broken	Repair	COMMUNICATION GUY WIRE IS DAMAGED/BROKEN. SECURED TO POLE WITH STAPLE. ADDRESS 1404 MORGAN RD. SAN BERNARDINO	NO
(E) Southern California Edison	N/A	Smith, Robert/DDI	tpnoinbox@sce.com	N-P	6/25/22	407115896 Verizon		tsmith@verizon.com		4930270E	34.014642	-117.46595	VERNON AVE & 40TH ST HARBOR BLVD 20' W/S 1080' S/O	Fontana	92509	N/A	Communication	CIP CLEARNC COMM GUY POLE	Guy	Clearance_Impaired	Repair	THIRD PARTY CLEARANCE IMPAIRED. COMMUNICATION POLE IS TOUCHING EDISON SPAN GUY. POLE IS ACROSS FROM 8350 40TH ST. JURUPA VALLEY.	NO
(E) Southern California Edison	N/A	Walker, Paul/DDI	tpnoinbox@sce.com	N-P	9/3/22	407286164 Verizon		tsmith@verizon.com		4513821E	34.240985	-119.25692	OLIVAS PARK RD	Ventura	93003	High Fire	Communication	CIP LOOSE COMM CBL/CND POLE	Cable_Conductor	Loose	Repair	lashing	NO



G.O. 95 Non-Conformance Notification

The following condition type(s) have been identified during the normal course of business. The identified member and their tenant may have created a safety and/or reliability condition that could adversely affect power and communication systems. The notification is serving as notice for the identified member to take appropriate action to rectify the infraction.

Reporting Member Information

Member Name/Code: (TCA) Teleport Communications America, LLC
Member Renter (if applicable): _____
Identified By: _____
E-mail: _____
Phone: _____
Date Identified: _____

Infraction Member Information

Infraction Member Name/Code: (ATC) Verizon Wireless
E-mail: _____
Phone: _____
Notification/Tracking Number: _____

Infraction Information

Pole Number: _____
Latitude: _____
Longitude: _____
Location Description: _____
City: _____
Zip Code: _____
High Fire Threat: High Fire
Location on Pole: Transmission Conductor
Problem Statement: Unauthorized Attachment
Component: Structure_Equip_Itself
Action Needed: Notify Communication Provider (CIP)
Additional Comments: _____
Photos: _____

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 599-3801

November 16, 2022

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, **at 12:17 p.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:**

Ms. Maria Ortiz	XO Communications
Ms. Valerie Mitwasi	Southern California Edison
Mr. Michael Pearson	Southern California Edison
Ms. Alicia Walsh	Southern California Edison
Mr. Kevin Flores	Southern California Edison
Ms. Marisol Bailey	Southern California Edison
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Mr. Earle Carrion	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Megan LaMon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Katy White	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time Warner Cable
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel Corporation/Sprint Communications CO.L. P
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Barry Consulter	AT&T California
Mr. Todd Dailey	AT&T California
Ms. Veronica Romero	AT&T California
Ms. Joy Young	AT&T California
Mr. Alvin Robielos	AT&T California
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Richard Soriano	City of Banning
Ms. Yvonne Johnson	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Nicholas Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Mr. Arturo Garcia	City of Glendale
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Services Inc.
Ms. Patti Ringo	Sonic Telecom, LLC
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Anali Spencer	Committee Staff

Ms. Ortiz called the meeting to order at 12:17 p.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Review of prior month’s meeting minutes - Ms. Ortiz opened the meeting by inquiring if there were any questions or concerns

regarding the previous meeting minutes. There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 2 – Interpretation of Routine Handbook – Ms. Ortiz opened the discussion to the members for any questions regarding the Routine Handbook. There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 3 – Item 1597: Review of Routine Handbook Examples (5/19/2015) – Ms. Ortiz opened the discussion on Review of Routine Handbook Examples.

Ms. Ortiz asked if there were any other new examples that any members would like to review or discuss. There were no comments or concerns at this time.

Agenda Item 4 - Item 1783: Lat and Long on the Form 2 (from Administrative Board – 2/16/2022). – Ms. Ortiz opened to lat./long. on Form 2. Ms. Ortiz stated this item was closed in the Administrative Board and could be removed.

Agenda Item 5 - Item 1787: Construction Correction Process (M. Ortiz - XO Communication - 07/11/22). – Ms. Ortiz opened to Construction Correction Process. She stated Mr. Harmon was out in the field and was unable to join in today's meeting. She stated this item will be tabled for the next Routine Revision meeting. Ms. Ortiz asked if there were any other objections to tabling this. There were no objections concerns at this time.

Agenda Item 6 – Miscellaneous Issues –

- **Adding the definition of Free Attachment** in the Routine Handbook from SCJPC Office (4/13/2022) - Ms. Ortiz opened to adding the definition of Free Attachment to the Routine Handbook. Ms. Black was going to make additional changes which she completed (see attached). Ms. Black stated that normally in red would be changes to the Routine Handbook, but that in this case it would all be new and the red this time was only the changes from the discussion at the previous meeting. This definition was to get more verbiage around how far down the lead the Free Attachment could be or how many pole. Ms. Black stated that Mr. Harmon wanted to have some clearance drop verbiage. Ms. Black stated that this was written and circulated in an email where everyone agreed it was good, but then it caused a lot of questions about what a clearance drop was. Mr. Bacon reviewed the definition and stated when free attachments travel

multiple spans it is because the Clearance drop is required to reach multiple premises. He stated that there are midspan taps going off the one line going across. If they have multiple homes, they do not have a good structure there. They get run off, LADWP calls them bridles, they are run off not even a support structure, just laterals running off their line. Mr. Bacon stated with those it would be a Free Attachment if they had to connect to a pole. Mr. Bacon stated that his is what Mr. Harmon was referencing. Ms. Black asked if Mr. Bacon was ok with adding that in there. Mr. Bacon stated Mr. Harmon did good adding that in there. Mr. Bacon was just translating it for the non-field people that may not know what Mr. Harmon was referencing to with the wording. Mr. Van Stryk stated to him it sounds like the Clearance drop is a run without a messenger if it is to feed multiple premises and that he knows they make self-supporting fibers now. A messenger is not needed as much as they used to. Mr. Bacon stated that what it basically comes down to if it is on the path of the line and they have to use the support structure to get to the feed point of a house, then that should be a Free Attachment. Mr. Bacon stated they have to add in a messenger or a support wire. He stated fiber optics have come a long way and could be beefed up with a tree wire to make them stronger but that it needs the language of the messenger, which usually travels only one pole span. He stated that the messenger or whatever is being used should be left in there because they do leave messengers to maintain the height for the top of the trucks even if they are running fiber optic it is never going to hold if they have the messenger backed up end to end with two anchors holding it. Mr. Bacon stated the messenger is typically going to sag higher and that is the problem when they have those residential and they do not have a pole and phone drops and cable tv drops go down too low and the trash trucks obliterate them. Mr. Van Stryk stated that it usually travels one pole span which is what is holding him back on this a little bit. He stated that this is going to turn into something it was not meant to be. Mr. Bacon asked if Mr. Van Stryk wanted to leave the language to one span or one structure. Mr. Treepaisan stated that the one span was what it was at Frontier and previously Verizon and GT. He stated it was one span with no messenger and was basically just for service drop. Mr. Treepaisan stated that their former practices categorized those as being a slack span, which they were limited to taking it only one pole span. He stated he would double check if anything has changed since they have become Frontier, but that in the past it was no messenger and only limited to one pole for their

practices. Mr. Treepaisan stated he is ok with what Mr. Harmon had prepared but that as Mr. Van Stryk stated it is traditionally a one span type of deal. Mr. Bacon asked if there was an SCJPC diagram for Free Attachments where it showed the poles on one side and then the other side. Ms. Black stated there were examples in page Section 11.2 in the Routine Handbook. Ms. Pranata pulled up the examples for the members to review. Ms. Black stated that letters A & C were the part of the example to look at. Mr. Bacon asked when letter D would become not a service but a line. If it would be when they add another structure. Mr. Bacon stated that to him if they have an alley, it would be an ideal situation as to why they both get Free Attachments. He stated it is typically one span, but the example defined it that they could go up to two spans. Ms. Black stated that she thought it was illustrating something that needs to have a purchase and only letters A & C showed Free Attachment. Mr. Treepaisan stated the other examples have an anchor highlighted which he stated to him implies tensioning and possibly a messenger. He stated they would not be adding an extra anchor if they were not adding tension which would be slack spans. Mr. Treepaisan stated that adding the anchor messenger redefines the situation. Mr. Bacon agreed. Mr. Van Stryk asked who wrote the last definition and that the drawing example needs to change. Mr. Bacon stated they would need to discuss this further and edit the diagram. Ms. Black asked if Mr. Bacon would do the edits he described because she would not know how to word what was just described. Mr. Bacon agreed he would. Mr. Van Stryk stated he could make the map and send it to the members to get their feedback. Mr. Bacon stated that if they will be doing illustrations that the communication companies may have something in their specification books on their construction standards. He stated if someone has an illustration indicating a service coming off a pole to volunteer that as well. Mr. Treepaisan volunteered to come up with some verbiage on a service drop definition and possibly an illustration. Mr. Treepaisan stated that he was ok with the verbiage of it traveling multiple spans but was quite sure Frontier's practices would not allow a slack span to go more than one pole span without a messenger. Mr. Bacon stated on a JPA if they have to put an anchor to hold a strain it changes it and will no longer be a Free Attachment and would have to look at that anchor situation as well.

- **Example 33 Revision:** Ms. Ortiz stated that this was done and only pending the Free Attachment changes.

- **Nonconformance/Form 11** - Ms. Ortiz opened to Nonconformance/Form 11. She stated the members were going to review the form internally and come back with feedback. Ms. Ortiz stated she did see a revised form go out as well. Ms. Mitwasi stated that there should not be a revised form but that a second copy of the same form was sent. Ms. Pranata clarified one copy was sent with the meeting minutes and she also sent it in an email for the members to review. Ms. Mitwasi stated there was two options for it. The regular form version and the excel layout. Ms. Mitwasi asked if the members required more time to review it. Ms. Black requested more time so she could send it to her GO 95 group. Mr. Treepaisan agreed to requiring more time. Ms. Mitwasi stated this could be tabled for January's Routine Revision meeting. Mr. Bacon asked if the interspace pole language was changed on the form. Ms. Ortiz asked Mr. Bacon to clarify. He stated he thought he saw language on interspace poles. Ms. Mitwasi stated that the language from the last form was carried over to the new form.
- **Steel Stubbing** - Ms. Ortiz opened to Steel Stubbing from Mr. Armstrong. Ms. Black was going to revise the section for steel stubbing (see attached). Ms. Mitwasi stated that SCE would like more time to review. Ms. Ortiz asked if the members were ok with that. The members agreed. This item will be tabled for the next Routine Revision meeting.
Ms. Ortiz asked if there were any other miscellaneous items. There were no further comments or concerns from the members.

Agenda Item 7 – Review of Action items/JPA Alerts –

- Mr. Van Stryk and Mr. Bacon will work on the diagram for Section 11. Mr. Treepaisan will work on it on the communication side.
- The members are to review the revised Form 11 internally and come back with feedback in January.
- The members are to review Section 19.7 for Steel Stubbing internally and come back with feedback in January.

The Meeting adjourned at 12:36 p.m. until January 18, 2023.

Anali Spencer – Committee Staff

**PRELIMINARY JOINT POLE AUTHORIZATION
ADDING GPS COORDINATES TO POLE LOCATIONS
EXAMPLE xx**

- (1) This transaction shows how to add GPS coordinates for a pole location.

Use WGS84 formatting, with 6 to 8 digits, and place under the Section 15.4 pole location address. (8 digits is most accurate.)

- (2) When the pole is replaced, it will move one foot on the address line, but using the same GPS coordinates is ok.

NOTE: When the existing SCJPC pole card does not have the GPS Coordinates, adding them to a Form 2 is preferred, but not required and should not be a reason for denial.

Date
Prepared 4/14/2022

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

Date
Sent 4/16/2022Confirming
AgreementIn
Field ☐By
Telephone ☐Est.
Const.
StartNo. of
Pages 1J.P.
Auth.No. U3-123-456

UTILITY	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT-DIVISION-EXCHANGE	APPROVED	TAXING INSTRUCTIONS	ACCOUNTING DATA
U1	JONES	LOS ANGELES	JONES	LOS ANGELES	5577303
U2	JOHNSON	LOS ANGELES	JOHNSON	LOS ANGELES	A403
U3	SMITH	LOS ANGELES	SMITH	LOS ANGELES	12345

POLE NO.	Pole Length Anchor Size	Year Set	Pole Trt	Record				Proposed					Item No.	LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK If not in accordance with Joint Pole agreement and routine-state reasons.
			Class											
			Anchor Direct.	U1	U2	U3		U1	U2	U3				
				L				L						U1 TO REPLACE POLE FOR BENEFIT OF U3 SEC 7.3, 10.8 1
1234U1	45	02	FT	39-9	23-5	24-1		PTD						DREAM RD S/S 212' W/O ONE WAY 2
			CL-3											33.881958, -118.274545 1 3
								1	1			83		U3 TO PAY U1 & U2 FOR TRANSFER 4
														5
5678U1	50	14	FT					43-13	23-5	24-1				DREAM RD S/S 211' W/O ONE WAY 6
														33.881958, -118.274545 2 7
														8
														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

NEVERLAND
COMMUNITY

VP/J.P.-03

Rev. Jul 2013

New section. 15.4- B GPS Coordinates

The GPS Coordinates, when known, can be listed under the 15.4 Pole Location Address on the LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK side of the Form 2. The coordinates should be 6 to 8 digits (8 being most accurate) and be formatted to WGS84 standard. When the existing SCJPC pole card does not have the GPS Coordinates, adding them to a Form 2 is preferred, but not required and should not be a reason for denial. See Example xx in Section 18, page 18-xx.

Under Section 18.1 A – add red below

RECORD FORMS

18.0 Record Forms

The forms used for expediting joint pole work and recording transactions are listed below:

Form #	Form Name
2-1	Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization
2-2	Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization
2-1 FINAL	Final Joint Pole Authorization
2-2 FINAL	Final Joint Pole Authorization
Form 7	Joint Pole Memorandum
Form 9	Joint Pole Riser Notification
Form 11	Notice of GO 95 Non-Conformance
Form 12	Pole Record
Form 16	Reallocation of Space
Form 44	Bill of Sale
Form 48	Notice of Work Completed
Form 49	Tracer

Hard or soft copies shall be provided as agreed by the parties.

(Revised January 2015)

18.1 Form 2 - Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization

Any agreement to undertake joint work must be confirmed in writing by using this form. This is authority to undertake joint work as specified. Member initiating transaction shall make necessary copies for each Member involved, all of which must be approved by an authorized representative of each involved Member. Approval may be by signature of the authorized representative to be shown on the forms in the space provided, or by the authorized representative's name, followed by the written initials of a delegated representative confirming the agreement. Names of representatives effecting agreement must be specified in space provided. Members that have various designated District, Division, or Exchange areas should identify the appropriate area by name. The Joint Pole Authorization number is assigned by the issuing Member. The Joint Pole Authorization number should begin with the Initiator's Member code and can have a maximum of 23 alpha or numeric characters only. The only exceptions are blank spaces or hyphens within the 23 maximum character count. If the Form 2 is revised, characters like RO1 or COR are not included in the maximum 23-character count for the F2 name (Revised March 2021).

18.1-A Preparation of Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization

By agreement, any Member may be designated as the constructing Member in joint work.

The Member initiating Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization shall specify its Authorization number and all required details of the agreement. The Joint Pole Authorization number shall begin with the current member's code. The Form 2 shall include, but is not limited to:

- (a) Pole Number
- (b) Nature of work
- (c) Applicable Routine Section Number
- (d) Designation of involved Members
- (e) Circuits
- (f) Interest
- (g) Grade
- (h) Space
- (i) Pole/equipment data, including jointly owned arms, anchors, risers, wireless and broadband equipment.
- (j) Other essential record data i.e. tenants, power communication (~~P. Comm~~)
- (k) Authorized Costs item number and number of items where required
- (l) Police and/or fire report or case number when applicable and available
- (m) Provide billing information when applicable billing sections are used
- (n) Estimated construction start date
- (o) Date sent
- (p) Date prepared
- (q) Pole Class for wood poles
- (r) Additional notes such as pending JPA numbers or corrections per field conditions
- (s) Pole loading analysis only for poles associated with the JPA. NOTE: (1) Members cannot dictate pole loading method and format however must meet all GO95 requirements (2) Section 4.1 refer to the section.
- (t) Optional drawing/map: highlight only the poles associated with the JPA (Revised June 2020).
- (u) GPS coordinates - When the existing SCJPC pole card does not have the GPS Coordinates, adding them to a Form 2 is preferred, but not required.

The Preliminary Form 2 shall be limited to 10 pages.

Where a specific transaction involves special agreement, it shall be designated as such on Joint Pole Authorization. (See Section 1.2)

It is the responsibility of all Members involved in the Joint Pole Authorization to see that data and details of the agreement are correct. The date Joint Pole Authorization is sent shall be used in completing the billing for structural and salvage values; except in replacements, the date poles are

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Tuesday, November 1, 2022 4:08 PM
To: Anali Spencer
Subject: Fw: [EXTERNAL] RE: Free Attachment

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee
909-599-3801 x8
Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:37 AM
To: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] RE: Free Attachment

Free Attachment verbiage for glossary

Free Attachment

Free attachments are specific to paralleling Member's leads with service conductors crossing thoroughfares directly to a premise served. Service drops that qualify as a Free Attachment do not have a Messenger and **usually** travels only one pole span. **When free attachments travel multiple spans it is because a clearance drop is required to reach multiple premises being served off the free attachment.** Free attachment requirements are detailed in Section 11.0 and depicted in Examples A and C on Page 11-2. (A free attachment remains a Free attachment when the pole is replaced.

Clearance Drop verbiage for glossary

Clearance Drop

A clearance drop is defined as being a free attachment that is needed to reach a multiple premise locations that will be served from the free attachment. These facilities have no messengers. A clearance drop is not to be confused with a clearance pole.

Kay Black

West ACE VP Staff – Joint Pole
2125 Occidental Road
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

MISC: FREE ATTACHMENT DEFINITION



From: Bacon, John R. <John.Bacon@ladwp.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:15 AM
To: Jeremy Harmon <JHarmon@motiveis.com>; BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>
Cc: Maria Ortiz <MOrtiz@motiveis.com>; YOUNG, JOY A <jv2453@att.com>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: Free Attachment

Awesome,

Thank you,

From: Jeremy Harmon <JHarmon@motiveis.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:11 AM
To: BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>; Bacon, John R. <John.Bacon@ladwp.com>
Cc: Maria Ortiz <MOrtiz@motiveis.com>; YOUNG, JOY A <jv2453@att.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Free Attachment

EXTERNAL EMAIL! This email was generated from a non-LADWP address. If any links exist, do not click/open on them unless you are 100% certain of the associated site or source. ALWAYS hover over the link to preview the actual URL/site and confirm its legitimacy.

Wow. I am seriously impressed! Did you record me? I could not have written it better.... BTW here is the Definition of a Clearance pole:

Rule 22.6-F

F. Service/Clearance Pole means a pole, required only to maintain above-ground clearances for service drops or to maintain service drop span limitations. Permissible attachments are limited to 0 - 750 volt conductors, supply service drops, associated risers and runs, communication facilities, lighting and its associated equipment, and guys.



Jeremy Harmon | Regulatory Manager Field Operations

P 818-898-2352 | C (818) 497-1297



9275 Corbin Ave., Northridge, CA, 91324 | motiveis.com

From: BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:07 AM
To: Jeremy Harmon <JHarmon@motiveis.com>; Bacon, John R. <John.Bacon@ladwp.com>
Cc: Maria Ortiz <MOrtiz@motiveis.com>; YOUNG, JOY A <jv2453@att.com>
Subject: Free Attachment

Hi Jeremy,

MISC: FREE ATTACHMENT DEFINITION

Can you please define a “clearance drop” for me? Is what I wrote below ok? I tried to capture what you said.....I think it needs help!!! Edit away please!

Free Attachment verbiage for glossary

Free Attachment

Free attachments are specific to paralleling Member's leads with service conductors crossing thoroughfares directly to a premise served. Service drops that qualify as a Free Attachment do not have a Messenger and **usually** travels only one pole span. **When free attachments travel multiple spans it is because a clearance drop is required to reach multiple premises being served off the free attachment.** Free attachment requirements are detailed in Section 11.0 and depicted in Examples A and C on Page 11-2. (A free attachment remains a Free attachment when the pole is replaced.

Clearance Drop verbiage for glossary

Clearance Drop

A clearance drop is defined as being a free attachment that is needed to reach a multiple premise locations that will be served from the free attachment. These facilities have no messengers. A clearance drop is not to be confused with a clearance pole.

Kay Black

West ACE VP Staff – Joint Pole
2125 Occidental Road
Santa Rosa, CA 95403



Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

-----Confidentiality Notice-----

This electronic message transmission contains information from the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, which may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail and delete the original message and any attachment without reading or saving in any manner.

**PRELIMINARY JOINT POLE AUTHORIZATION
REMOVAL & REPLACEMENT OF AN INTERSET POLE
EXAMPLE 33**

(1) The first transaction shows U2 to remove (or removing) their clearance attachment from pole.

(2) The second transaction shows U1 replacing the pole. U2 will maintain clearance attachment on the new pole.

(3) The third transaction shows U1 replacing the pole. For this transaction, U2 will need additional footage on the new pole. Due to the additional footage, U2 will no longer qualify as a clearance attachment, U2 will be a joint owner on the new pole.

MISC: NONCONFORMANCE/FORM 11

G.O. 95 Non-Conformance Notification																							
REPORTING MEMBER INFORMATION						INFRACTING MEMBER INFORMATION				INFRACTION INFORMATION (One line per infraction)													
Reporting Member Name/Code:	Member Renter (if applicable):	Identified By (Last Name, First Name):	E-mail:	Contact Phone:	Date Identified:	Notification/Tracking Number:	Infractioning Member Name/Code:	E-mail:	Contact Phone No.:	Pole Number:	Latitude:	Longitude:	Location Description:	City (Provide Full Name):	Zip Code:	High Fire Threat:	Location of Insfraction on Pole, Select Elevation:	Problem Statement:	Component:	Condition:	Action Needed/Task Action Description:	Additional Comments:	(Pending) Photos:
(E) Southern California Edison	N/A	Walker, Paul/DDI	tpnoinbox@sce.com	N-P	7/17/22	406266262 Verizon	tsmith@verizon.com			2015675	34.168418	-117.31768	SHERIDA RD 308' W/O MORGAN RD	REDLANDS	92373	High Fire	Communication	CIP DAMAGE COMM GUY POLE	Guy	Damaged_Broken	Repair	COMMUNICATION GUY WIRE IS DAMAGED/BROKEN. SECURED TO POLE WITH STAPLE. ADDRESS 1404 MORGAN RD. SAN BERNARDINO	NO
(E) Southern California Edison	N/A	Smith, Robert/DDI	tpnoinbox@sce.com	N-P	6/25/22	407115896 Verizon	tsmith@verizon.com			4930270E	34.014642	-117.46595	VERNON AVE & 40TH ST HARBOR BLVD 20' W/S 1080' S/O	Fontana	92509	N/A	Communication	CIP CLEARNC COMM GUY POLE	Guy	Clearance_Impaired	Repair	THIRD PARTY CLEARANCE IMPAIRED. COMMUNICATION POLE IS TOUCHING EDISON SPAN GUY. POLE IS ACROSS FROM 8350 40TH ST. JURUPA VALLEY.	NO
(E) Southern California Edison	N/A	Walker, Paul/DDI	tpnoinbox@sce.com	N-P	9/3/22	407286164 Verizon	tsmith@verizon.com			4513821E	34.240985	-119.25692	OLIVAS PARK RD	Ventura	93003	High Fire	Communication	CIP LOOSE COMM CBL/CND POLE	Cable_Conductor	Loose	Repair	lashing	NO



G.O. 95 Non-Conformance Notification

The following condition type(s) have been identified during the normal course of business. The identified member and their tenant may have created a safety and/or reliability condition that could adversely affect power and communication systems. The notification is serving as notice for the identified member to take appropriate action to rectify the infraction.

Reporting Member Information

Member Name/Code: (TCA) Teleport Communications America, LLC
Member Renter (if applicable): _____
Identified By: _____
E-mail: _____
Phone: _____
Date Identified: _____

Infraction Member Information

Infraction Member Name/Code: (ATC) Verizon Wireless
E-mail: _____
Phone: _____
Notification/Tracking Number: _____

Infraction Information

Pole Number: _____
Latitude: _____
Longitude: _____
Location Description: _____
City: _____
Zip Code: _____
High Fire Threat: High Fire
Location on Pole: Transmission Conductor
Problem Statement: Unauthorized Attachment
Component: Structure_Equip_Itself
Action Needed: Notify Communication Provider (CIP)
Additional Comments: _____
Photos: _____

MISC: STEEL STUBBING - SECTION 19.7

19.7 Reinforcement of Poles Changes in red

Poles may be reinforced with steel sleeve, fiberglass wrap, stubs/trussing, mod/poles, etc. by mutual agreement with other owners of record.

(See Authorized Costs Items 6, 17 or 18)

The reinforcing Member is responsible for placing the pole tag as specified by good construction standards, as well as for miscellaneous hardware, i.e., visibility strips, pole steps, etc.

Other items which may be associated with the reinforcement process, such as asphalt or concrete repairs (see Section 19.6), shall be shared equally with all owners.

The added labor cost to the base cost of reinforcement resulting from risers or other facilities which increase the labor cost shall be borne by the owner of such facilities.

It is not the intent of this rule to prohibit reinforcing in emergencies where advance approval cannot be obtained.

If replacement of reinforced pole is desired by one joint owner within ~~three~~ five years, beginning with January 1 following date of the reinforcement, this owner shall reimburse the other owner(s) for its proportion of the original reinforcement costs.

Where joint owners agree to replace reinforced pole for mutual benefit, the reimbursement shall not apply. In all cases, pulling, transporting, and disposing shall be a joint expense and shall apply to pole only. (Refer to Section 2.7D)

Question to the Members; How is the stub disposed of?