

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

January 19, 1999

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

Mr. Chris Bengtsson – City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dan Lewis – GTE California
Ms. Jayme Willis – Pacific Bell
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Pacific Bell
Ms. Kathleen Dell – Los Angeles Cellular
Ms Sherri Goetz – So. California Edison
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Chairman Chris Bengtsson called the meeting to order. The first topic of discussion involved **Item 1207: Pole Inspection**, which was referred from the committee on Authorized Cost Elements. The Routine Committee developed new language (attached) for Sections 2.7H (Other Billing Definitions & Directives) and 19.5 (Inspection of Poles) of the *Routine Handbook* to support item 12 (Pole Inspections) in the Authorized Cost, Maintenance section of the *Routine Handbook*. It was proposed to place the new language on the consent calendar concurrently with Authorized cost item number 12.

The next topic was **Item 1253: Cost Causer**. This item is waiting for further development of the Joint Pole Automated System. A discussion whether items pending the computer system development should be tracked separately followed.

The Committee then tackled **Item 1251: section 16.4B Grandfathering**. The committee struggled with the pole space that becomes available when “grandfathering” is applied. As an example: with power as the base owner; utility C is recorded at 23’ down 5’, utility P is recorded at 39’ down 6’, and P TN at 27’ down 4’ on a 45’ pole. A field check reveals that utility C is attached at 25’. The question is, should C be grandfathered at 25’ down 7’ or should the interest be shown with C at 25’ grade down 1’ then at 23’ grade down 5’? All in attendance were asked to establish a position on what they thought would be equitable as far as the distribution of that space.

Ms. Dell brought up a discussion about attaching to an existing arm when purchasing into a pole for the first time. This is covered in Sec. 4.4 and Sec. 14.1.

The following interpretation was a consensus of the group attending. When an incoming joint member is planning on attaching to an existing arm, they must reimburse the joint member(s) who own the arm under Authorized Cost Item 160 and/or Item 164 as appropriate. Item C & E, under both of these items, is intended to be used when an incoming Joint member is installing an arm in space currently owned by another member, and is transferring that member onto the arm at “No Charge”.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

444 E. Huntington Drive, Suite 205
Arcadia, CA 91006
Phone (626) 294-0820
Fax (626) 294-0872

February 16, 1999

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

Mr. Chris Bengtsson	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Ernie Solorzano	So. Calif. Edison Co.
Ms. Jayme Willis	Pacific Bell
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Air Touch Cellular
Ms. Sherri Goetz	So. Calif. Edison
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	Pacific Bell
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Greene	Committee Staff

Chairman, Chris Bengtsson called the meeting to order. Mr. Bengtsson requested the members to review the minutes from the prior meeting.

Ms. Willis stated that paragraph 3 on the previous minutes was unclear and should be corrected. The subject in the paragraph refers to grandfathering. It does not account for all the footage on the pole. It does not state whether the base owner is power or communication. The example will be revised for the January Routine Minutes.

Ms. Willis stated Section 16.4-B should include verbiage that refers to Section 20.1 in parenthesis.

Mr. Solorzano requested assurance that the verbiage for Section 16.4-B could not be misconstrued in any way.

Mr. Bengtsson said the primary purpose for Section 16.4-B was to have the pole records reflect the actual pole activity in the field.

Mr. Bengtsson read the new verbiage to be added to Section 16.4-B, which reads as follows, "The space grandfathered shall be only for 1' of occupied space. Any additional space not shown on record shall be purchased per section 4.X without penalty." Section 16.4-B will go on the discussion calendar of the February 17, 1999 Administrative Board Meeting.

AIRTOUCH CELLULAR
AT&T COMM. OF CALIF., INC.
BURLINGTON NORTH. SANTA FE RY
CITY OF ANAHEIM
CITY OF AZUSA
CITY OF BURBANK
CITY OF COLTON
CITY OF GLENDALE
CITY OF LOMPOC

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CITY OF PASADENA
CITY OF RIVERSIDE
CITY OF VERNON
COX COMMUNICATIONS PCS, L.P.
GTE CALIFORNIA, INC.
ICG TELECOM GROUP, INC.
LOS ANGELES CELLULAR
L.A. CO. METRO TRANS. AUTH.

MCI METRO/ATS
MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS
MEDIA ONE
PACIFIC BELL
PACIFIC BELL MOBILE SERVICES
SOUTHERN CALIF. EDISON CO.
SOUTHERN CALIF. WATER CO.
TCG LOS ANGELES

Also brought to the attention of those in attendance was, that a form 7 was no longer permitted to be used to change pole records. The changes would occur through the processing of JPAs.

The following item was the new language for Section 19.5 and Section 2.7H.

It was agreed that the new verbiage would go on the Administrative Board Agenda under discussion for the February 17, 1999 meeting.

The next topic of discussion was Unauthorized Attachment Penalties. Mr. Solorzano raised concern for clearer verbiage in Section 4.0, when applying a price for penalties. Members participate in the maintenance and reconstruction of poles; however, the price of the penalty does not cover costs. Mr. Solorzano cautioned that the treatment of members versus tenants must be consistent, or risk being brought up against the CPUC. Mr. Solorzano requested those members in attendance upon returning to their companies to discuss the topic and be prepared to discuss further in the next Routine Revision Meeting.

Ms. Willis brought up the final item of discussion, which covered Hand Dig Pole Sets. New verbiage is required for Section 14.9. The current Authorized Cost, Item no. 9, is not in effect until explanation in Section 14.9 is completely done. Mr. Solorzano had a concern with cost recovery for a hand dig, which exceeds the typical.

Ms. Willis suggested verbiage for Section 14.9, which reads as follows:

“The cost for hand digging a hole for a pole replacement, or new set, where the labor required is excessive due to abnormal field conditions the cost will be shared equally among all pole owners. Some of the field conditions, or situations, where this could apply are 1) set in rock, or 2) placing between conflicting sub-structures.”

Section 14.9 will be discussed further in the next Routine Revision Meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 PM.

Chris Bengtsson, Vice President

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

444 E. Huntington Drive, Suite 205
Arcadia, CA 91006
Phone (626) 294-0820
Fax (626) 294-0872

March 16, 1999

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

Mr. Chris Bengtsson	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dan Lewis	GTE of Calif., Inc.
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Air Touch Cellular
Ms. Kathleen Dell	Los Angeles Cellular
Ms. Sherri Goetz	So. Calif. Edison Co.
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	Pacific Bell
Ms. Ernie Solorzano	So. Calif. Edison Co.
Mr. Ralph Hammond	Sprint PCS
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

Chairman Chris Bengtsson called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. He asked those in attendance to review the minutes from the prior meeting.

Ms. Hernandez stated that on page 2, paragraph 3, the second sentence was incomplete and unclear. The sentence should read, "Members participate in the maintenance and reconstruction of poles; however, the price of the penalty does not cover the costs." Ms. Dell requested to have the last two sentences in the above mentioned paragraph to read, "Mr. Solorzano requested those members in attendance upon returning to their companies, discuss the topic and be prepared to discuss further in the next Routine meeting." The requests were noted, and will be corrected in the February Routine minutes.

The first item on the agenda was Item 1207: Pole Inspection, which is on hold until further notice from Authorized Costs.

Item 1269: Unauthorized Attachment Penalties was the next item on the agenda. Mr. Solorzano had an issue with the administering of penalties to third parties that are illegally attached. Effective May 1, 1999, So. California Edison intends on imposing a \$500.00 penalty against illegally attached third parties.

AIRTOUCH CELLULAR
AT&T COMM. OF CALIF., INC.
BURLINGTON NORTH. SANTA FE RY
CITY OF ANAHEIM
CITY OF AZUSA
CITY OF BURBANK
CITY OF COLTON
CITY OF GLENDALE
CITY OF LOMPOC

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CITY OF PASADENA
CITY OF RIVERSIDE
CITY OF VERNON
COX COMMUNICATIONS PCS, L.P.
GTE CALIFORNIA, INC.
ICG TELECOM GROUP, INC.
LOS ANGELES CELLULAR
L.A. CO. METRO TRANS. AUTH.

MCI METRO/ATS
MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS
MEDIA ONE
NEXTLINK
PACIFIC BELL
PACIFIC BELL MOBILE SERVICES
SOUTHERN CALIF. EDISON CO.
SOUTHERN CALIF. WATER CO.
TCG LOS ANGELES

Mr. Solorzano stated that, in the past, some members have been discovered attached on the poles unauthorized. Their penalty is 50% of the cost. Members attached without authorization are just as negligent as third parties that employ this common practice. However, third parties are fined \$500.00 as opposed to only 50% of cost. His concern is third parties will claim this procedure is unfair.

Mr. Bengtsson agreed that Mr. Solorzano had a legitimate concern; however, members show a good intent to comply with the Routine Handbook as well as, carrying overhead expenses for the committee office. Mr. Solorzano stated that the practice of special treatment toward members could be misconstrued as collusion by the CPUC. The Committee could risk being dismembered by the CPUC.

According to Ms. Dell members and tenants could have different rules and regulations; however, not to the extent of hindering a competitive edge.

Mr. Solorzano will not impose a penalty unless tenants are clearly, without any gray area, attached without authorization. He plans on using cross validation to determine, clearly without doubt, whether a tenant attached without authorization is in violation and a penalty is justified.

Mr. Bengtsson suggested upon returning to their office that those in attendance contact their legal department in regards to the issue in question, and be prepared to discuss at the next Routine Meeting.

The next topic on the agenda was Item: 1258, 18.1/Rearrange or Transfer. Mr. Lewis had a concern with Section 10.8 of the Routine Handbook. Mr. Lewis suggested that, prior to members' rearranging/transferring on a pole, a signature on the JPA be obtained. Members should not be allowed to use Section 18.1-D in this situation. Mr. Bengtsson suggested adding the verbiage, "Section 18.1-D does not Apply" at the end of Section 10.8. Mr. Bengtsson instructed Ms. Corella to place Item. 1258 on the discussion calendar of the Administrative Board Meeting for March 17, 1999.

The final topic of discussion was Pole Tagging-Responsibility. Item no. 1283 was assigned to this issue. The primary concern centered on responsibility for tagging a pole when discovered the tag was missing. Ms. Dell suggested the responsibility should be the base owner. Mr. Solorzano responded by stating that the public removes tags within 48 hours of applying them. It was agreed that the responsible party would be the member who, while working on the pole, discovers the tag missing. New verbiage was suggested for Section 15.1-A by rewording the second sentence to read, "Member issuing an authorization and identifying a pole without a pole tag will re-tag with the original number. Costs will be shared as specified in the Authorized Costs, Item 15." The last sentence of Section 15.1-A will be deleted. The agreed cost for Item 15, Pole Tagging, of Authorized Costs was \$25.00. Mr. Bengtsson instructed Ms. Corella to put Item 1283: Pole Tagging on the discussion calendar of the Administrative Board Meeting for March 17, 1999.

Routine Revision
March 16, 1999
Page 3

Item numbers 1282: Extending time limits to 60 days, and Item 1265: Composite poles were on the agenda, but were not discussed in length. It was decided both items remain open on the agenda for further discussion at the next Routine Revision Meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m., until April 21, 1999.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

444 E. Huntington Drive, Suite 205
Arcadia, CA 91006
Phone (626) 294-0820
Fax (626) 294-0872

May 18, 1999

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

Mr. Malcolm Brown	AirTouch Cellular
Ms. Lynn Prescott	AirTouch Cellular
Mr. Chris Bengtsson	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Ralph Hammond	Sprint PCS
Mr. Dan Lewis	GTE Calif., Inc.
Mr. Mike Bogner	Sprint PCS
Mr. Ernie Solorzano	So. Calif. Edison Co.
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	Pacific Bell
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Greene	Committee Staff

Chairperson, Chris Bengtsson called the meeting to order at 9:15 am. He began the meeting by stating that the Committee had not met since March 16, 1999. Perhaps a review of the March minutes would help everyone remember where everyone stood on each agenda item.

The first item on the agenda was **Item 1207**: Pole Inspection. This item is pending in Authorized Costs. A matrix has been created which will show if two members are participating in an authorized program by agreement. An "Mark" on the X and Y-axis intercept will reflect the two members in agreement. Mr. Bengtsson stated that with the Routine Handbook in place, is the matrix necessary. Ms. Hernandez responded by stating that the matrix was for JPAs, and was a way to clear the dollars. Mr. Lewis said that the matrix is for Section 2, which means it, is a billing directive. After some discussion, Mr. Bengtsson asked again if the matrix was still necessary, and should remain an open item. Mr. Solorzano stated that the members must be aware of what an authorized maintenance program entails, and what they are getting for their investment. They must be aware of this before they are asked to accept the program. Mr. Solorzano than stated that once an Authorized Costs is established as part of the Routine, that perhaps the matrix will not be necessary. Mr. Bengtsson said the next step would be for himself and Mr. Solorzano to work on an Authorized Costs for maintenance and, consider

AIRTOUCH CELLULAR
AT&T COMM. OF CALIF., INC.
BURLINGTON NORTH. SANTA FE RY
CITY OF ANAHEIM
CITY OF AZUSA
CITY OF BURBANK
CITY OF COLTON
CITY OF GLENDALE
CITY OF LOMPOC

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CITY OF PASADENA
CITY OF RIVERSIDE
CITY OF VERNON
GTE CALIFORNIA, INC.
ICG TELECOM GROUP, INC.
LOS ANGELES CELLULAR
L.A. CO. METRO TRANS. AUTH.
MCI METRO/ATS

MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS
MEDIA ONE
PACIFIC BELL
PACIFIC BELL MOBILE SERVICES
SOUTHERN CALIF. EDISON CO.
SOUTHERN CALIF. WATER CO.
SPRINT PCS
TCG LOS ANGELES

dropping the matrix. Mr. Solorzano brought up the issue of payment for pole inspection

based on the type of inspection. He asked if anyone had an issue with this once an Authorized Cost was in place. Mr. Brown then asked if this meant four inspection types would equal four authorized costs. Mr. Solorzano responded that was correct. All in attendance stated that they did not have an issue with inspection types. Item 1207 will remain open pending authorized costs.

Item 1269: Unauthorized Attachment Penalties was the next item on the agenda. Mr. Solorzano reminded those in attendance, that at the prior Routine Meeting, he stated that Edison would be imposing a \$500.00 fine to cable companies attached without authorization. This will be delayed for 30 days pending negotiating a contract with the cable companies. Mr. Solorzano reiterated the importance of reminding members who are found attached without authorization, will be imposed the \$500.00 fine as will any third party unauthorized attachments. He feels this issue should be brought before the Board. Mr. Bogner inquired how Mr. Solorzano arrived at the \$500.00 cost of fine. Mr. Solorzano responded that it is the lowest amount that can be charged per the CPUC Pulsiver Decision. Mr. Lewis remarked that perhaps the Routine Handbook should differentiate between an unauthorized versus an undocumented attachment. Mr. Solorzano will fax members in attendance documentation on the Pulsiver Decision. Ms. Prescott inquired as to where the monies would be directed. Mr. Bengtsson answered that the CPUC stated it be given to the base owner. Item 1269 will remain open on the agenda.

The next **Item 1282:** extending time limits to 60 days was discussed. This issue originated with GTE. Mr. Lewis said after rethinking the issue he felt it could be removed from the agenda. In an internal meeting the decision was, if there is not a response in 45 days, an additional 15 days will not make much of an impact. The decision was to close Item 1282.

Composite Pole, **Item 1265**, was next up for discussion. Mr. Solorzano reported that a decision as to where and when to use composite poles has not yet been reached. The task of assigning a cost is still not complete. Mr. Bengtsson suggested renaming Item 1265 to Alternative to Wood Poles. Mr. Solorzano stated that when a composite pole is used it will need to be designated on the JPA, or the assumption will be that it is a wood pole. The suggestion was to give a section to Alternative to Wood Poles. Mr. Bengtsson asked if whether a whole section is required or just Authorized Cost. Mr. Brown stated that the language must be clear and simple, and perhaps using Section 7.12. Mr. Bengtsson suggested everyone review the issue, and upon returning next month be prepared to discuss further. Item 1265 will remain open on the agenda.

Routine Revision
May 18, 1999
Page 3

Item 1286: Hand Dig Pole was next up for discussion. An Authorized Cost had been established for Hand Dig Pole which was Item 9 - \$375.00, but verbiage was needed for Section 14.9. Language had been created, but Board approval is required. Item 1286 will go on the Discussion Calendar for the May Administrative Board Meeting.

The final discussion covered **Item 1235:** Cost Causer. Mr. Lewis reported that upon full implementation of the Opcats system, those members still processing JPAs using hard copy documentation via mail, will be imposed with an appropriate fee. Item 1235 will remain open pending on the implementation of Opcats.

Under Misc. Items, Mr. Solorzano questioned the cost of permits, and whether these costs are included in the JPA. Mr. Solorzano questioned the idea of sharing the cost. Mr. Brown said he is of the opinion that this is a cost of doing business in that area. Mr. Lewis agreed that is how he sees it.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m. until June 15, 1999.

Jennie L. Corella, Office Manager

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

444 E. Huntington Drive, Suite 205
Arcadia, CA 91006
Phone (626) 294-0820
Fax (626) 294-0872

June 17, 1999

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 10:35 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Chris Bengtsson	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dan Lewis	GTE California
Mr. Ernie Solorzano	Southern California Edison
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	Pacific Bell
Mr. Malcolm Brown	AirTouch Cellular
Mr. Stewart McClausland	Nextlink

Chairperson, Chris Bengtsson called the meeting to order. The first topic of discussion involved Item 1207: Pole Inspection, *Section 19.5*. New language was created for Section 19.5, (Attachment 1), with reference to Item 12 in Authorized Costs. The new language for Section 19.5 will be on the **Discussion Calendar** of the July Administrative Board Meeting. Authorized Costs for Pole Inspections was created at the last Authorized Costs meeting.

Section 19.5 refers to Section 2.7H. *Section 2.7H, Approved Maintenance Program*, (Attachment 2), was created with the idea of using a matrix showing those utilities engaged in an Authorized Maintenance Program. The consensus is to disregard the matrix, and replace it with a list of the members who have a maintenance program in place that has been approved by the Committee Administrative Board. Section 2.7H (Attachment 2), will be on the **Discussion Calendar** of the July Administrative Board Meeting.

Mr. Solorzano stated the verbiage in Section 19.5 uses the terms Authorized or Approved Maintenance Program, and questioned the exact definition of approved program. Mr. Bengtsson recommended creating a definition for authorized or approved maintenance program in the glossary. Mr. Lewis suggested deleting the term Authorized from Section 19.5 and only using the term Approved Maintenance Program. The term Approved Maintenance

AIRTOUCH CELLULAR
AT&T COMM. OF CALIF., INC.
BURLINGTON NORTH. SANTA FE RY
CITY OF ANAHEIM
CITY OF AZUSA
CITY OF BURBANK
CITY OF COLTON
CITY OF GLENDALE
CITY OF LOMPOC

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CITY OF PASADENA
CITY OF RIVERSIDE
CITY OF VERNON
GTE CALIFORNIA, INC.
ICG TELECOM GROUP, INC.
LOS ANGELES CELLULAR
L.A. CO. METRO TRANS. AUTH.
MCI METRO/ATS

MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS
MEDIA ONE
PACIFIC BELL
PACIFIC BELL MOBILE SERVICES
SOUTHERN CALIF. EDISON CO.
SOUTHERN CALIF. WATER CO.
SPRINT PCS
TCG LOS ANGELES

Routine Revision

June 17, 1999

Page 2

Program will be defined in the Glossary under section F. The verbiage for Page G-1, Section F (Attachment 3), will be on the **Discussion Calendar** of the July Administrative Board Meeting.

The next topic of discussion was Item 1269: Unauthorized Attachment Penalties. The issue is penalizing third parties at a different rate than members. Mr. Bengtsson read the information received from his legal department. According to his interpretation, there is no problem in imposing a different rate to third party attachments. Mr. Solorzano expressed his concern with the CPUC Pulsiver Decision, and its ramifications, if different rates are implemented. There was discussion to put Item 1269 on the Discussion Calendar for the July Administrative Board meeting. However, the final consensus was it remain open in Routine for further discussion.

The next topic on the agenda was Item 1265: Alternative to Wood Poles. This item will remain open pending direction from Authorized Costs. Item 1235: Cost Causer will also remain open pending direction from the Computer Committee.

Item 1284: GPS-Legal Description was next for discussion. The issue is whether to implement this method for recording pole location. New language was recommended for *Section 15.4 Pole Location for Record Purposes* (Attachment 4), referring to GPS as an acceptable pole recording method. The new verbiage for Section 15.4, will be on the **Discussion Calendar** of the July Administrative Board Meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 PM.

Jennie L. Corella, Office Manager

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

444 E. Huntington Drive, Suite 205
Arcadia, CA 91006
Phone (626) 294-0820
Fax (626) 294-0872

July 20, 1999

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 1:00 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Chris Bengtsson	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dan Lewis	GTE California
Ms. Lynn Prescott	AirTouch Cellular
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	Pacific Bell
Ms. Sherri Goetz	So. Calif. Edison Co.
Mr. Mike Torelli	City of Riverside
Mr. Cory Autrey	Pacific Bell Wireless
Mr. Malcolm Brown	AirTouch Cellular
Mr. Mike Bogner	Sprint PCS
Mr. Dennis Ennis	Pacific Bell
Ms. Jennie L. Corella	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Greene	Committee Staff

Chairman, Chris Bengtsson called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. The first topic of discussion involved Item 1269: Unauthorized Attachment Penalties. Ms. Goetz reminded the members that this issue was going to be discussed at the next Administrative Board Meeting. Ms. Hernandez stated that originally the members had been requested to review the Pulsiver Decision with their respective legal departments, and whether they were in violation if a \$500.00 penalty was assessed to non-members. Ms. Hernandez stated that the Pacific Bell legal department did not see the penalty as a restraint of trade, because third parties have the option to become members. This issue will continue to be discussed at future Routine Meetings.

The next topic of discussion involved Item 1265: Alternative to Wood Poles. This issue is on hold until further notice from Authorized Costs. When costs are set, then the language will be created in Routine.

The next issue on the agenda was Item 1235: Cost Causer. This issue is

AIRTOUCH CELLULAR
AT&T COMM. OF CALIF., INC.
BURLINGTON NORTH. SANTA FE RY
CITY OF ANAHEIM
CITY OF AZUSA
CITY OF BURBANK
CITY OF COLTON
CITY OF GLENDALE
CITY OF LOMPOC

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CITY OF PASADENA
CITY OF RIVERSIDE
CITY OF VERNON
GTE CALIFORNIA, INC.
ICG TELECOM GROUP, INC.
LOS ANGELES CELLULAR
L.A. CO. METRO TRANS. AUTH.
MCI METRO/ATS

MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS
MEDIA ONE
PACIFIC BELL
PACIFIC BELL MOBILE SERVICES
SOUTHERN CALIF. EDISON CO.
SOUTHERN CALIF. WATER CO.
SPRINT PCS
TCG LOS ANGELES

on hold pending the implementation of the Opcats Operating system. This issue concerns the establishment of a cost for continuing to process paperwork, manually, once the Opcats System is completed.

The next item discussed was Item 1287: Pole Mounting Equipment in Common Space. Mr. Autrey, who had initiated the issue, stated that every utility has their own specific guidelines in regards to mounting equipment on poles. His suggestion was that having uniform guidelines would simplify, and expedite the process. Mr. Bengtsson stated, because it is a construction issue, this falls under G.O. 95. The allowance of pole mounting equipment on common structure is not in the guideline of the Joint Pole Agreement. Individual members should decide how he or she services their customers. The Committee cannot dictate to members their service requirements. The issue of aesthetics was raised. Ms. Prescott stated that, usually, the first utility mounted on a pole does not have trouble with obtaining a permit. Eventually, the municipalities, under pressure from their constituencies, and the issue of aesthetics, will then refuse any further permits. Mr. Brown stated there are G.O. 95, member utilities, and future meter reading considerations that must be considered. He is of the opinion, that there is not a need of guidelines for pole mounting in the Routine Handbook. The final consensus was, guidelines for pole mounting are not necessary in the Routine Handbook. An announcement will be made at the next Administrative Board meeting, that Item 1287: Pole Mounting Equipment on Poles is closed.

Under miscellaneous items, Ms. Prescott requested the need for clarification of Section 4.4-Purchase of Interest at Same Grade, and Section 14.1-Arms to be Jointly Owned. She stated her office is receiving JPAs that are attaching to arms free of charge and other JPAs where the attachment is being paid. There is lack of consistency, and her office is unsure in how to process such JPAs. The costs pertaining to these sections are under Authorized Costs, Item 164. Item numbers 164A-D pertains to new arms, where Item 164E, pertains to an existing arm. There is no charge for Item 164E, except the one-foot of interest on the pole. There will always be a charge for attaching to a power arm. Everyone referred to the example on page 18-11. Line 7 refers to 160C. It was clarified that Item 160 refers to crossarms/guardarms, and Item 164 is for cablearms. Item 160C is for attaching to an existing cross/guardarm, at no cost. The example on page 18-11 should be referred when there is any questions on attaching to existing arms.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m., until August 17, 1999.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE
444 E. Huntington Drive, Suite 205
Arcadia, Ca. 91006
Phone (626) 294-0820
September 14, 1999

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 10:35 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Malcolm Brown – AirTouch Cellular
Mr. Chris Bengtsson - City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dan Lewis - GTE California
Ms. Kathleen Dell - Los Angeles Cellular
Ms. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Ms. Sherri Goetz - So. Calif. Edison Co.
Mr. Ralph Hammond - Sprint PCS
Mr. Mike Torelli – City of Riverside
Mr. Cory Autrey – Pacific Bell Wireless
Ms. Pamela Gozzo – Sprint PCS
Mr. Mike Bogner – Sprint PCS
Ms. Lynn Prescott – AirTouch Cellular
Mr. Steward McClausland – Nextlink California
Ms. Jennie L. Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Chris Bengtsson called the meeting to order. The first topic of discussion involved Item 1269: Unauthorized Attachment Penalties. This item is on hold because members were requested to inquire within their respective legal departments the issue of accessing a penalty fee of \$500.00 to non-members, while the fee to members is approximately \$50.00. If in doing so, can this be construed as a restriction of trade to non-members? Mr. Bengtsson stated that DWP, Pac Bell, and GTE had responded stating that their respective legal departments did not see any conflict or restriction of trade. This item will remain on the agenda for further discussion.

Item 1265: Alternative to Wood Poles was next on the agenda. Currently, Routine is waiting for costs from Authorized Costs. When the costs are established, Routine will work on creating the corresponding language. Ms. Hernandez stated that a separate section would be required for the language corresponding to Authorized Costs. She noticed that section 6 is available. Mr. Lewis stated that the majority of the Routine Handbook deals with wood poles, therefore a separate section would be necessary. Ms. Dell stated that poles other than wood fall into the category of steel poles, and her office has processed JPAs with steel poles. Mr. Autrey remarked that steel poles are handled under special agreement. The issues of alternative poles will have to be addressed. Some obvious issues are the costs, which are higher than wood, and the installation is more complex than wood. Mr. Bengtsson stated that this issue must be addressed in Routine, and that a section is needed. He then suggested, when referring to wood poles in any section of the Routine, to address alternative poles as well. Ms. Hernandez suggested using section 7.12 as alternative to wood. Mr. Bengtsson stated that considering section 7.12 as alternative to wood is a good suggestion, and to review the Routine to see the impact of adding section 7.12. Mr. Autrey suggested creating a list of issues to consider when using alternative poles. The members offered the following issues and costs to be considered:

- Installation Costs
- Transfer Costs
- Structural
- Transportation Costs
- Disposal Costs
- Maintenance Costs
- GO 95
- Tagging
- Depreciation/Salvage
- Tagging/Topping

Mr. Brown remarked that construction of alternative poles should be monitored to ensure correctness. The issue of stepping and the correct manufacturing of alternative poles were discussed. Mr. Autrey inquired as to whether Edison was capturing any issues when installing fiberglass poles. Mr. Bengtsson announced that a utility structure conference is scheduled in October in Reno, Nevada. The issues of alternative poles will be addressed, and he recommends attending the conference. Item 1265 will remain on the agenda for further discussion.

The next item on the agenda was Item 1235: Cost Causer. This item deals with the issue of additional costs incurred by members who are unable to use the OPCaTS System. The item will remain on the agenda pending the implementation of the system.

Next topic discussed was Item 1289: Loading on Poles. Mr. Lewis stated, initially this was a concern with Edison. Mr. Brown stated that Edison's major concern is the over-lashing and overbuilding on poles. Ms. Dell stated that another concern is the wind loading issue, and testing for wind loading on leads. Mr. Bengtsson commented that this is a GO 95 issue. This issue falls in the Routine under Section 1.0 under the rules of joint pole practices. It does not specifically address wind loading, however this is a common utility practice.

Mr. Autrey inquired that when a JPA is issued, is it safe to assume wind loading has been addressed. Ms. Dell responded that wind loading should be addressed.

Mr. Bengtsson asked the members if they felt anything was needed in the Routine to address wind loading. He is of the opinion that there is no need of it in the Routine. Mr. Torelli stated that the issue is, who is responsible to check if a wind-loading test was conducted. Ms. Dell responded saying that the members do not police one another. That members are aware of their individual responsibilities. Mr. Bengtsson stated that policing could create problems. The decision is to discuss this issue with Edison, locate any major concerns, and to leave this issue on the agenda for further discussion.

Item 1290: Attaching to Existing Arms was next on the agenda. This item was previously discussed in the January 1999 Routine Revision meeting, and addressed again at the July 1999 Routine Meeting. Ms. Dell stated that the intention was never to allow someone to attach to an arm at no charge. She feels there should be reciprocity to the member who initially installed the arm. Ms. Prescott stated that her office is receiving JPAs with costs for attaching to an existing arm and JPAs with no charge for attaching. According to Ms. Prescott there is a lack of consistency, and she feels the costs are not applicable. These costs need clarification.

Mr. Brown remarked when a member initially constructs in an area, allowing for incoming member attachment, the reciprocity is when you attach to an existing arm constructed by an earlier member. He stated that this is how the Committee, as a cooperative forum, chooses to operate.

Mr. Bengtsson stated the verbiage in Section 4.4 needed revision. New language was created for Section 4.4, and the final consensus is that reimbursement occurs with the purchase of the foot of space on the pole. Authorized Costs 164E and 160C will remain at no charge.

The final topic of discussion involved phone calls. Mr. Torelli's concern is the inability to obtain a response to phone calls in places to members. Currently, he is having a problem with Edison and Pac Bell. Ms. Goetz asked Mr. Torelli to contact her in the future with any problems, and she will help him obtain a response.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m., until October 1999.

Jennie L. Corella, Office Manager

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

444 E. Huntington Drive Suite 205

Arcadia, Ca. 91006

Phone (626) 294-0820

Fax (626) 294-0872

November 16, 1999

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 1:30 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Chris Bengtsson - City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dan Lewis - GTE California
Ms. Lynn Prescott - AirTouch Cellular
Ms. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Mr. Dennis Ennis - Pacific Bell
Mr. Ernie Solorzano – So. Calif. Edison Co.
Ms. Sherri Goetz - So. Calif. Edison Co.
Mr. Ralph Hammond – Sprint PCS
Mr. Mike Bogner - Sprint PCS
Mr. Jennie L. Corella - Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Greene – Committee Staff

Chairman, Chris Bengtsson called the meeting to order. The first topic of discussion involved Item 1269: Unauthorized Attachment Penalties. Mr. Solorzano stated the need to establish a cost that would deter entities from attaching illegally. He noted using the Pulsiver decision allowed cost of \$500.00, or a similar agreed upon cost. His opinion is that the penalty should be at a cost that would discourage unauthorized attachments. Currently, members are penalized 50% the cost of the pole for illegal attachments. In some instances this equates to as little as \$40.00 per pole. In Mr. Solorzano's opinion, the penalty fine is minimal, and does not discourage illegal attachments. He reiterated the need to address this issue, establish a cost, and remove it from the Routine agenda.

Mr. Bengtsson explained the reason that Item 1269 continues to remain on the agenda. The members were to review with their respective legal departments, the issue of penalizing third party entities the \$500.00 fee, as opposed to the 50% cost of a pole as a penalty fee to members for illegal attachment. The CPUC could misconstrue the inequality of the two penalties as a restraint of trade toward third party entities, while penalizing members a lesser fee. He stated that some members reported that according to their legal department, it was not a restraint of trade because third party entities have the right to join the Committee. He asked the members if anyone disagreed that this issue should be addressed. All the members agreed that this issue needs to be addressed. He then asked if a special committee should be assigned to handle Item 1269, or continue to work on it in Routine. Mr. Lewis recommended using Section 4.5, titling it to read "Failure to Purchase Interest", arrive at an agreed penalty, and differentiate from Section 4.1. Mr. Solorzano suggested working on the verbiage for Section 4.5, and discussing it at the next Routine Revision Meeting. Ms. Prescott suggested limiting the occurrence in a certain area as opposed to individual poles. Item 1269 will be discussed further at the next Routine Revision meeting.

The next topic of discussion involved Item 1265: Alternative to Woods poles. Mr. Bengtsson stated that previously, it was decided that this issue would be an Edison pilot project,

before going forward with Routine. Mr. Solorzano stated that he did not want to handle composite poles under Section 1.2 for longer than one year. Ms. Goetz stated Section 15.5 refers to treatment of poles. Ms. Hernandez suggested adding CF for composite fiberglass to Section 15.5. Mr. Solorzano then inquired if Section 15.5 refers to steel poles.

Mr. Bengtsson reiterated what was to be done in Routine in reference to alternative to wood poles. In Section 15.5, under treatment types, a code for composite, fiberglass, and steel poles must be added to the section. Ms. Hernandez stated that if prices for alternative to wood poles are added to the Routine, then verbiage to address this issue must be created. She also stated the need of verbiage to Section 2, billing directives, for the Committee billing processors. Mr. Solorzano suggested a change to the verbiage, as opposed to creating a new section. Ms. Hernandez suggested using Section 2.4F and 1.2 for composite fiberglass poles to aid the billing processors.

The final issue on the agenda was Item 1235: Cost Causer. The item will remain on the agenda pending implementation of the OpCats Systems.

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m. until January 18, 2000

Jennie L. Corella, Office Manager