

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

March 21, 2001

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 12:45 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Chris Bengtsson - City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dan Lewis - Verizon California
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Ms. Sherri Goetz - So. California Edison Co.
Mr. Ernie Solorzano – So. California Edison Co.
Mr. Mike Bogner – Sprint PCS
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena
Mr. Dough Schnader – City of Pasadena
Mr. Sean Matlock – So. California Water
Ms. Jennie L. Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Chris Bengtsson called the meeting to order. The first item on the agenda was **Item 1235: Cost Causer**. This item deals with the issue of additional costs that will be applied to those members who choose not to, or 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 1269: Failure to Purchase Interest**. Mr. Bengtsson explained that this item deals with the March 1999 Pulsiver decision and the \$500.00 allowable penalty fee charged to utilities that are illegally attached. Mr. Bengtsson reported that Mr. Solorzano has created language pertaining to this issue. Mr. Solorzano stated that something should be in the Routine that reflects that members are not treated differently than non-members in regards to illegal attachments. Currently, members are charged a penalty of 50% of structural value, which at times may be a fraction of the \$500.00 penalty fee. He is of the opinion that by placing language in the Routine that refers to the \$500.00 penalty stating that it will be imposed upon members, as well as non-members, after March 1999 will protect the Committee from appearing unfair by the CPUC. Mr. Bengtsson stated that the members would take the new language back to their organizations for review, and discuss once again in Routine before bringing it to the Board for Discussion. (proposed language at end of report).

The third issue on the agenda was **Item 1300: Pole Set in Same Hole**. Mr. Solorzano stated that what he is attempting to do is to set a cost for a typical application when placing a pole in the same hole. He stated that guidelines and criteria would be established to identify a typical application. Mr. Bengtsson stated that although there would be an Authorized Cost for

this issue, there is always the option of negotiating any costs above and beyond the set costs. Mr. Bengtsson stated that the need of a field meet was discussed in that the other utility had the option to decide using this method. The Routine would need to reflect any requirements for a field-meet.

Mr. Bengtsson stated that members should submit what they feel is a reasonable baseline set cost for this application. The members will return next month with what they feel is a reasonable cost, as well as criteria recognizing a typical situation.

The fourth issue on the agenda was **Item 1307: Pole Class.** Ms. Hernandez stated that this issue deals with wind loading and the strength of a class of poles. Ms. Dell stated that pole class should be reflected on a JPA, and pole cards. It has been recommended that the table on page 15-3 needs to be reviewed and updated. This issue will be discussed further at the next Routine meeting.

Under miscellaneous items Mr. Bengtsson reported that he found the language in **Section 14.9** ambiguous. Mr. Bengtsson stated that he is almost certain that his pole costs do not include hand dig. When hand digging is required, DWP is adding Section 14.9 to the JPA to recover the additional expense. He stated that according to the section, this would only apply to abnormal conditions. In Mr. Bengtsson's opinion this section should apply whenever hand dig is required, regardless of the soil/field condition. The problem DWP is experiencing is that utilities are citing Section 14.9, and stating that the situation is not an abnormal condition, and that hand digging is a normal condition. Ms. Hernandez stated that she was of the opinion that the cost of hand digging was included in the price of the pole, because it was a normal condition. Ms. Hernandez reiterated that hand dig should be included in the pole price. She stated that before changing the language in Section 14.9, perhaps DWP should review the method in which they do pole pricing. The members discussed this issue extensively. This issue will be revisited at the next Routine meeting.

The final topic of discussion was the method applied for setting pole prices. Mr. Solorzano reported that in 1999 DWP submitted the price for a 45' pole at \$2213.00, and in 2000 the price was \$1,099.00. In 1999 SCE's cost for the same pole was \$1782.00, averaging to \$1805.00. Mr. Solorzano is of the opinion that by using DWP's prices in arriving at costs tends to skew the weighted average because DWP's prices are substantially low. The issue of revisiting the 2001 pole prices was addressed. The consensus was to put on the Discussion Calendar for the April Board meeting the issue of re-visiting the 2001 pole prices. Item Number 1312 was assigned to the **Review of 2001 Pole Prices.**

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m., until April 26, 2001.

Southern California Edison Company

Subject: SCJPC Routine Handbook: Revisions Section 4.1

4.1A Unauthorized Attachment prior to March 1999

Each case requiring joint ownership in a pole shall constitute an unauthorized attachment if the Member making such attachment fails to initiate Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization. Said Member shall be required to purchase interest at structural value and pay an added 50% penalty as per date Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization is issued, providing that said unauthorized attachment was made prior to March 1999.

4.1B Unauthorized Attachment after March 1999

Additionally, any Member failing to initiate Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization under the previously described conditions in 4.1A, after March 1999, will be subject to a \$500 penalty as per date Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization is issued, for each unauthorized attachment incurred in another owning Member's pole space.

Under no circumstances does the identification and subsequent billing for an unauthorized attachment as described in the previous paragraphs, relieve the infringing Member from its obligation to construct, inspect and maintain its facilities in a manner consistent with the California Public Utilities Commission's General Order 95 and 128, or any other condition described herein. In all cases, issuing Member retains the discretionary power to ascertain the nature and intent of each unauthorized attachment.

Excluded from this section are:

- (a) Case where a joint owner has made attachment on pole at a higher or lower grade than allowed for the space purchased. This owner must:
 - (i) Relinquish and relocate to the proper grade in accordance with Section 5.1D, or (ii) Purchase interest in accordance with Section 4.0.
- (b) Poles set in current year.
- (c) All interset poles where services are originated from clearance attachments thereon.

In cases, a(ii), b and c, purchase of interest shall be required at structural value only, and Member issuing Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization shall specify Routine Section 4.0 for such purchase.

NOTE 1: This section does not apply to anchors.

NOTE 2: Refer also to Sections 5.1, 7.7 and 16.4B

Subject: SCJPC Routine Handbook: Revisions Section 5.1D

5.1-D Unauthorized Attachment - Procedure for Relinquishment

Member discovered with unauthorized attachment made prior to March 1999, instructed to vacate pole, shall purchase interest at structural value, with 50% added as an Authorized Cost, remove identified unauthorized attachments and shall relinquish all interest.

Member discovered with unauthorized attachment made after March 1999, instructed to vacate pole, shall pay issuing Member a \$500 penalty and remove identified unauthorized attachment.

Where owner of pole relinquishes interest, Member with unauthorized attachment shall purchase entire interest, in which case 50% added charge does not apply.

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

April 26, 2001

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 12:45 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Chris Bengtsson - City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dan Lewis - Verizon California
Mr. Dennis Ennis – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Ms. Sherri Goetz - So. California Edison Co.
Mr. Ernie Solorzano – So. California Edison Co.
Mr. Mike Bogner – Sprint PCS
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Doug Schnader – City of Pasadena
Ms. Jennie L. Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Chris Bengtsson called the meeting to order. The first item on the agenda was **Item 1235: Cost Causer**. This item deals with the issue of additional costs that will be applied to those members who choose not to, or are unable to use the OPCaTS System. This item will remain on the agenda pending the implementation of the system.

Next topic discussed was **Item 1269: Failure to Purchase Interest**. Mr. Bengtsson stated that Edison has created language pertaining to this issue. Mr. Solorzano stated that this issue is linked to Authorized Costs, and will be addressed at the following meeting. Mr. Solorzano stated that many members were of the opinion that the Pulsiver decision did not pertain to the Committee and joint owners. Mr. Solorzano stated that he would like to see language in the Routine Handbook that would deter owners from unauthorized attachments. Mr. Lewis stated that in his opinion, the current language in the Routine that speaks to unauthorized attachments is sufficient. It was decided that this issue remains on hold on the agenda pending on Authorized Costs.

The third issue on the agenda was **Item 1300: Pole Set in Same Hole**. Mr. Bengtsson stated that this issue is also linked to Authorized Costs. When a cost is established for this item, then, Routine Revision will work on the language.

The fourth issue on the agenda was **Item 1307: Pole Class**. The members discussed this issue and it was decided that the table on page 15.6 needs updating. Ms. Corella was instructed to send this table to the members via e-mail requesting they update it and return it to the Committee office.

Under Miscellaneous items Mr. Bengtsson opened discussion on pole topping. He stated that he was of the opinion that the costs for pole topping were in 5-foot increments per cut. The members stated that they did not remember the costs being in 5-foot increments. Authorized Cost item number 5.C for pole topping is \$149.00 per cut, and not necessarily in 5-foot increments. Mr. Bengtsson stated that he would relay this information back to his organization.

Ms. Goetz opened the discussion for Pole loading. Mr. Bengtsson stated the discussion should start with how to approach pole loading. Mr. Bengtsson stated that the issue of pole loading could require an ad hoc committee. He mentioned whether poles are being utilized by geographical space or strength capacity. He gave an example of an owner utilizing one foot of space, but using 40% of the strength of the pole. He further stated that this example has an impact on the sale of space, because, a pole may have the available space but not the strength capacity. Mr. Bogner stated that the pole base owners do not have uniform criteria for pole loading. Mr. Lewis stated that Verizon has set a standard for their licensees. He would e-mail the members a copy for their review.

Mr. Solorzano reported that SCE is in the process of identifying structures that may be relinquished to the State, and whether they are jointly owned. He stated that if any members are joint owners on such poles, then there is the possibility that they may need to enter into a third party agreement with the state. But, it is very likely that most of the poles relinquished to the state are not jointly owned.

The members discussed the issue of identifying on record those poles with antennas or microcells attached. Item number 1314 has been assigned to Antenna/Microcell Identification for further discussion in Routine.

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m., until May 17, 2001.

Jennie L. Corella, Office Manager

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

May 17, 2001

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 2.30 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Chris Bengtsson - City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dan Lewis - Verizon California
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Ms. Sherri Goetz - So. California Edison Co.
Mr. Ernie Solorzano – So. California Edison Co.
Mr. Mike Bogner – Sprint PCS
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Doug Schnader – City of Pasadena
Ms. Jennie L. Corella - Committee Staff

Guest:

Mr. Dennis Walls - City of Los Angeles

Chairman, Chris Bengtsson called the meeting to order. The first item on the agenda was **Item 1235: Cost Causer.** This item deals with the issue of additional costs that will be applied to those members who choose not to, or are unable to use the OPCaTS System. Ms. Goetz inquired whether the Committee would agree at a cost for the additional work. Ms. Lewis responded that in his opinion setting a cost at this time is premature. However, he stated that at the OPCaTS training session, the City of Riverside representative had inquired about the consequences regarding a member choosing not to participate in the OPCaTs program. Mr. Lewis stated that when the program is fully running, then a decision would be made on costs. Until then this item will remain open.

The next issue on the agenda was **Item 1300: Pole Set in Same Hole.** Mr. Bengtsson stated that this issue is pending on what results from the Authorized Costs Committee. Authorized Costs will discuss this issue, and upon arriving at a cost Routine Revision will draft any language associated to any costs.

The third issue on the agenda was **Item 1307: Pole Class.** This issue deals with the table on page 15.3 in the Routine Handbook. Ms. Corella confirmed that she e-mailed the members requesting they review the table to ensure that the specifications meet their requirements in regards to pole class. The Routine does not state whether this table is for new place or replacement poles, however, it was agreed that any pole that is jointly owned must follow the table specifications.

Item 1299: Joint Utility Practices/Pole Loading was discussed next. Mr. Solorzano stated that within his organization this issue has been discussed, and he would like some questions addressed. The first question was, “If a pole is currently overloaded and deteriorated, how do you treat it?” Ms. Dell responded that in her opinion, it should be treated as a deteriorated pole. However, she stated that as an incoming party, if it is discovered that the pole is merely overloaded, but not deteriorated, than the overloading party must bear the expense of correcting the problem.

Mr. Bengtsson stated that the issue is overloaded, not deteriorated poles. He stated that the objection is to identify what is the role of the Committee in regards to pole loading. He further stated that the Committee is not a regulatory organization, but a clearing/recording administration. Mr. Bengtsson reminded everyone that the criterion for membership is recognition by the CPUC as a utility entity, therefore, it is the responsibility and obligation of every member to abide by all rulings set by the CPUC. The CPUC mandates pole-loading requirements. Ms. Dell agreed, however, she suggested that perhaps a committee should be formed to address some general guidelines to be agreed upon by the Committee members, and followed within the Committee. The members discussed this issue at length. This item will remain on the Routine agenda for further discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m., until June 21, 2001.

Jennie L. Corella, Office Manager

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

June 26, 2001

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 10.30 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Chris Bengtsson - City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dan Lewis - Verizon California
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Ms. Sherri Goetz - So. California Edison Co.
Mr. Ernie Solorzano – So. California Edison Co.
Mr. Malcolm Brown - Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Jennie L. Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Chris Bengtsson called the meeting to order. The first item on the agenda was **Item 1235: Cost Causer.** As was agreed in prior meetings, this issue will remain open pending on the implementation of the OpCATs system.

The next issue on the agenda was **Item 1300: Pole Set in Same Hole.** Mr. Bengtsson stated that this issue is contingent on Authorized Costs. It will remain open until it is closed in Authorized Costs.

The third issue on the agenda was **Item 1307: Pole Class.** This issue deals with the table on page 15.3 in the Routine Handbook. Ms. Corella reported that the only responses from the e-mail she sent to the members requesting them to review the table to ensure that the pole class correlates with their current specifications are from SCE and DWP. It was decided that Ms. Corella update the table from the received responses, and e-mail the table to the members for their review, stating it would be on the July Discussion Calendar of the Administrative Board meeting.

Item 1299: Joint Utility Practices/Pole Loading was discussed next. This issue will remain on the agenda for further discussion. Ms. Dell remarked that this issue should continue to be addressed on a regular basis because of the possibility of any ill effects on the base owners should something be overlooked in regards to pole loading.

The final issue discussed was **Item 1314: Antenna/Micro-Cell Identification.** Mr. Solorzano stated that his primary objective is to have these structures identified on the pole card,

Routine – June 26, 2001

which would allow SCE employees to be aware of such attachments and determine required clearances. Mr. Brown inquired if SCE requires directional and omni-directional identification, to which Mr. Solorzano responded the affirmative. Ms. Hernandez inquired what effect the required clearances would have on the common area of a pole. The response was that the space and grade identified on the JPA would handle the common area situation.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m., until July 19, 2001.

Jennie L. Corella, Office Manager

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

August 16, 2001

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 - Verizon California
Mr. Mike Bogner – Sprint PCS
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Ms. Sherri Goetz - So. California Edison Co.
Mr. Ernie Solorzano – So. California Edison Co.
Mr. Doug Schraderder – City of Pasadena
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn George – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Jennie L. Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Chris Bengtsson called the meeting to order. The first item on the agenda was **Item 1235: Cost Causer**. As was agreed in prior meetings, this issue will remain open pending on the implementation of the OpCATs system.

The next issue on the agenda was **Item 1300: Pole Set in Same Hole**. Mr. Bengtsson stated that this issue deals with setting a standardized cost. After much discussion it seems that the Committee decided that each situation was so unique that a standardized cost could not be set. Ms. Dell inquired as to what the concern was since this situation has always been handled by special agreement. Mr. Solorzano responded that the requests for this type of construction have increased, and with the increased volume SCE is losing revenue. Ms. Dell remarked that perhaps the loss in revenue is an internal training issue with SCE. SCE employees should agree with the other joint owners at a field meet what is equitable in order to ensure that SCE does not lose revenue, and include any additional agreed upon costs on the JPA. Mr. Bengtsson questioned Ms. Dell if a situation arose where the cost for setting in same hole was \$4,000.00 and if discovered that setting the pole alongside would cost \$3,500.00, would she then agree on the \$4,000.00 cost. He questioned Ms. Dell if she would find it beneficial to know prior to a field meet the costs of setting in same hole with A, B, or C costs associated with the three most frequent situations and not just an arbitrary estimated cost. Ms. Lewis stated that as mentioned in prior meetings, each situation is special, unique, and different. Therefore, a standard cost cannot be set in his opinion, and what would A, B, and C costs be based upon. He stated that he continues to support the need of a field meet for a pole set in same hole. After much discussion, the members decided that this agenda item would remain open for further review.

The third issue on the agenda was **Item 1307: Pole Class.** This issue deals with the table on page 15.3 in the Routine Handbook. Ms. Corella responded that the only responses received to a request of updating the table are from DWP and SCE. This item will remain open for any further responses.

Item 1299: Joint Utility Practices/Pole Loading was discussed next. This issue is an ongoing item, and will remain on the agenda as a continued reminder to the Committee of the need to periodically address it.

The final issue discussed was **Item 1314: Antenna/Micro-Cell Identification.** Mr. Solorzano reported that SCE continues to work on this policy. When this is completed he would inform the Committee. Mr. Bengtsson stated that it would be the responsibility of Routine Revision to create a section and verbiage to indicate to members the proper method of recording antenna information on the JPA in that it would appear on the pole records.

Miscellaneous Items

Under miscellaneous items Mr. Bengtsson addressed the issue of **Section 14.9 – Hand Dig.** He stated that he and Ms. Hernandez have been discussing the interpretation of hand dig in that it is clear to all members. Mr. Bengtsson stated that according to his interpretation, if due to sub-structure or abnormal condition a hand dig would be required, AC item 9 would be charged on the JPA. He inquired if his interpretation was correct or incorrect, because this is how he has been instructing his field people. Some members reported that certain line items in Section 14.9 were lined out in their handbooks. It was thought at one time that by eliminating these lines would help in addressing the interpretation issue. Mr. Bengtsson stated that these lines are ambiguous as to what constitutes abnormal conditions. Ms. Hernandez stated that according to Pac Bell, hand dig should be embedded in the overall pole cost. Mr. Bengtsson stated that when risers are involved the only option is to hand dig, and hand digging is a high cost expense. Today, the quantity of risers that are on poles has multiplied and risers are not part of pole prices. After much discussion Mr. Bengtsson stated that his primary objective is to cover the additional costs that DWP incurs when using hand-dig. The members discussed embedding hand dig costs into the 2002 pole costs. The members will discuss this issue further at future meetings.

Ms. Dell raised the issue about poles that are being replaced after being inspected and reinforced within the last three years. Mr. Bengtsson stated that according to the Routine, members should be reimbursed if this happens within this time frame. Ms. Dell questioned as to how this is monitored, because she does not see this happening. It was decided that the responsibility of identifying this situation is up to the member on the receiving end of the JPA. Ms. Dell thanked the members for helping her with clarification of the issue and that at this time she was satisfied in understanding how to handle this issue.

The meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m., until September 20, 2001.

Jennie L. Corella, Office Manager

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

September 20, 2001

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 11:00 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Chris Bengtsson - City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dan Lewis - Verizon California
Mr. Mike Bogner – Sprint PCS
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Ms. Sherri Goetz - So. California Edison Co.
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn George – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Jennie L. Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Chris Bengtsson called the meeting to order. The first item on the agenda was **Item 1235: Cost Causer**. As was agreed in prior meetings, this issue will remain open pending on the implementation of the OpCAts system.

The next issue on the agenda was **Item 1300: Pole Set in Same Hole**. Mr. Bengtsson stated that this is an Edison issue, therefore, this item would remain open at the request of Ms. Goetz. Ms. Goetz stated this is pending on current research within her organization.

The third issue on the agenda was **Item 1307: Pole Class**. This issue deals with the table on page 15.3 in the Routine Handbook. Ms. Corella reported that prior to updating the table she would need some clarification from Mr. Solorzano. She stated the table would be ready for the next Routine Revision meeting for approval and perhaps closing of this item.

Item 1299: Joint Utility Practices/Pole Loading was discussed next. Mr. Bengtsson stated that in his opinion all members are mandated to conform to the stringent GO 95 requirements for pole loading, therefore, to impose requirements by the Committee should not be necessary. The members agreed that this issue has been discussed extensively, and that all members are fully aware of the CPUC requirements in regards to pole loading. Therefore, it was agreed to close this item at this time.

The final issue discussed was **Item 1314: Antenna/Micro-Cell Identification**. Mr. Bengtsson stated that this is an Edison issue. Mr. Lewis reported that according to the last Routine meeting, Mr. Solorzano reported that his organization continues to work on this issue. Mr. Bengtsson stated that the role of Routine is to create the language for this item. Therefore, when Mr. Solorzano is ready, the Committee will work on creating the language. This item remains open until Mr. Solorzano's organization has completed its research project.

Miscellaneous Items

Under miscellaneous items Ms. Corella reported that it has been brought to her attention that Authorized Costs item 17A,B, and C do not refer to mod poles, and the Committee office is receiving JPAs which refer to mod poles. However, mod poles are mentioned in Section 19.7, but does not refer to AC item 17A-C. The members discussed this issue and it was agreed that verbiage would be deleted from Section 19.7. In the first paragraph, last sentence in brackets the verbiage "item 6" would be omitted.

Mr. Bengtsson raised the issue of receiving JPAs that are not appropriately completed. He is aware that new members are not trained in the process of preliminary JPAs, however, it does create additional work for his personnel out in the field. Ms. Dell stated that she is working with some new members on the correct method of processing preliminary JPAs.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m., until October 18, 2001.

Jennie L. Corella, Office Manager