

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

January 16, 2002

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 10:45 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
Mr. Dennis Ennis – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Doug Schmaderer – City of Pasadena
Mr. David Filson – City of Burbank
Ms. Jennie L. Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Chris Bengtsson called the meeting to order at 10:50 a.m. 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 the Authorized Costs committee is discussing a standard cost for setting a pole in the same hole. When this cost is established, then the Routine Revision committee will develop the language associated with the Authorized Cost. Mr. Solorzano reported that at the last Authorized Costs committee meeting it was decided to bring the minutes where he had suggested a standard cost range for a pole set in the same hole. The Authorized Costs committee plans on discussing the establishment of a standard cost for this item at the next meeting.

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. The members reviewed the revised table, and after minor corrections, it was agreed to accept the matrix as proposed. This item is now closed.

The next issue discussed was **Item 1314: Antenna/Micro-Cell Identification**. Mr. Solorzano opened the discussion by stating that the primary issue is establishing a method of identifying these structures on a JPA. He stated that any poles with the above-mentioned

structures should be identified so that the SCE crew working on that site is aware and able to plan. As well as planning, his organization is concerned with the safety of their employees. It was decided to add verbiage to Section 18. Under Section 18.1-A (h), the additional verbiage was added: *including wireless and broadband equipment*. It was agreed that this language would encompass any wireless equipment. This item is now closed.

The next discussion was Item **1320: Vegetation Management**. Mr. Solorzano reported that this issue is a work in progress within the Authorized Costs committee. He should have information to report to the Routine committee at the next meeting.

Item 1324: Survey Costs was the next item on the agenda. This item was assigned at Authorized Costs; therefore, it will remain pending until Authorized Costs establishes a survey cost.

Miscellaneous Items

The last item on the agenda was Miscellaneous Item's. Ms. Hernandez stated that she had a concern with costs for hand dig. She reported that SBC Pacific Bell, Los Angeles Department of Water and power, and Southern California Edison had met in the field on September 28, 2001 to discuss hand dig. She distributed a handout reflecting issues discussed. It was agreed that **Item 1325: Hand Dig**, would be assigned to the **Routine Revision** committee to establish specific language directing which instances would warrant a hand dig charge. This item will be discussed at length at the next Routine Revision committee.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m., until February 20, 2002.

Jennie L. Corella, Office Manager

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

February 20, 2002

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. J. Craig Wayment – City of Glendale
Mr. David Filson – City of Burbank
Mr. Dan Lewis - Verizon California
Mr. Mike Bogner – Sprint PCS
Mr. Cory Autrey – Sprint PCS
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Mr. Ernie Solorzano – Southern California Edison
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn George – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Jean Baccus - Committee Staff

In the absence of Chairman, Mr. Malcolm Brown, Mr. Chris Bengtsson chaired the meeting. The meeting was called to order at 10:45 a.m. 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**. The Authorized Costs committee has created Authorized Costs Item 19 Cost for placing pole back in the same hole. Therefore, Routine Revision created additional verbiage for Section 7.4 to correlate with Authorized Costs Item 19. The proposed section would read as follows:

7.4 Replacement of Pole in Same Hole

This section provides for the replacement of a pole in the same hole to accommodate the transfer of facilities attached to the old pole. The differential cost of the setting of the new pole when it is mutually beneficial to all members shall be shared equally by all parties. When the placement of a pole in the same hole is not mutually beneficial, the cost shall be borne by the Member requesting this type of construction procedure. ~~Where differential costs have been identified, Section 1.2 will be used. (Some of these costs are available in the authorized cost tables).~~ Hand dig charges are not applicable as an added cost when poles are being replaced in the same hole. Refer to Authorized Costs Item 19.

This issue will be on the Discussion Calendar of the March Administrative Board Meeting

The next discussion was Item **1320: Vegetation Management**. Mr. Solorzano reported that he is proposing an Authorized Cost of \$16.00 for Item 13: Pole Access Obstruction. The proposed costs and additional verbiage are as follows:

13. Pole Access Obstruction:

- a) Clearing poles in State Responsibility Area.....\$16
(includes cost of contractor to perform activity and post quality control inspection).
- b) All other by Special Agreement Section 1.2.

The members agreed that this item would be on the Discussion Calendar for the February Board meeting.

Item 1324: Survey Costs was the next item on the agenda. This item is contingent on Authorized Costs. It will remain open at this time.

Item 1325: Hand Dig was the next item discussed. The members reviewed and discussed Section 14.9 of the Routine Handbook. After much discussion the members agreed on the following verbiage:

14.9 Hand Dig Pole

The cost for hand digging a hole for a pole replacement, or new set, ~~where labor required is excessive due to abnormal field conditions the cost~~ will be shared equally among all pole owners. (See Item 9 of Authorized Costs) ~~Some of the field conditions, or situations, where this could apply are 1.) set in rock, or 2.) placing between conflicting sub-structures.~~

This issue will be on the Discussion Calendar of the March Administrative Board Meeting with the possibility of approval.

Under Miscellaneous Items the members assigned Item 1326: JPA Volume to the agenda of Routine Revision for discussion at the next meeting. This issue will address the volume of JPAs sent by one member to another member within a given month.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m., until February 20, 2002.

Jean Baccus, Senior Billing Associate

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

March 20, 2002

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

Mr. Chris Bengtsson - City of Los Angeles
Mr. J. Craig Wayment – City of Glendale
Mr. David Filson – City of Burbank
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena
Mr. Sean Matlock – Southern California Water
Mr. Dan Lewis - Verizon California
Mr. Mike Bogner – Sprint PCS
Mr. Ross Cutshaw – Sprint PCS
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn George – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Mr. Malcolm Brown called the meeting at 12:05 p.m. 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 second issue on the agenda was **Item 1300: Pole Set in Same Hole**. The ad hoc Authorized Costs Committee created a new item number and associated costs. The costs and additional verbiage were approved at the Administrative Board Meeting of the same date. Therefore, this item is now closed.

The next issue on the agenda was Item **1326: JPA Volume**. Ms. Hernandez opened the discussion stating she was aware that you cannot limit the number of JPAs initiated by a member. However, she is of the opinion that members should take consideration when submitting a large number of JPAs to individual members. She stated that her organization did not have the resources to handle such a large volume, and that she would be opposed if the submitting member would approve the JPAs via Section 18.1. She is aware that the Routine Handbook lacks any language addressing this issue. Mr. Lewis stated that if language for limiting JPA volume per month were entered into the Routine Handbook, the interpretation could be construed as a restraint of trade. Ms. Dell agreed with Mr. Lewis and reiterated that the Committee cannot limit JPA volume without misinterpretation of trade restraint. Those in attendance agreed that this was an internal problem with that member which did not have the resources to handle an unexpected increased volume of JPAs. This issue was discussed extensively among the members, and it was agreed that this problem should be dealt with

individually among the concerned parties. Therefore, it was agreed that this item should be closed at this time.

The final issue for discussion was **Item 1325: Hand Dig.** This item was on the Discussion Calendar of the Administrative Board meeting of the same date with proposed language revision. However, it was agreed at the Board meeting that the proposed revision needed rework. The members discussed this issue and arrived at the following revised verbiage:

Current:

14.9 Hand Dig Pole

The cost for hand digging a hole for a pole replacement, or new set, where labor required is excessive due to abnormal field conditions the cost will be shared equally among all pole owners. (See Item 9 of Authorized Costs) Some of the field conditions, or situations, where this could apply are 1.) set in rock, or 2.) placing between conflicting sub-structures.

Proposed:

14.9 Hand Dig Pole

~~The cost for hand digging a hole for a pole replacement, or new set, where labor required is excessive due to abnormal field conditions the cost will be shared equally among all pole owners. Hand dig charges do not apply for pole set in same hole, or poles set in rear property. (See Item 9 of Authorized Costs) Some of the field conditions, or situations, where this could apply are 1.) set in rock, or 2.) placing between conflicting sub-structures.~~

The members agreed that Item 1325: Hand Dig is ready for presentation to the Board for approval.

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m. until April 17, 2002.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

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

April 17, 2002

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. J. Craig Wayment – Altrio Communications
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Doug Schmaderer – City of Pasadena
Mr. Sean Matlock – Southern California Water
Mr. Dan Lewis - Verizon California
Mr. Ernie Solorzano – Southern California Water
Ms. Karren Fleuret – ICG Communications
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Mr. Mahendra Garg – City of Anaheim
Mr. June Santiago – City of Anaheim
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn George – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Mr. Malcolm Brown called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m. The first item on the agenda was **Item 1235: Cost Causer**. This item is contingent on the implementation of the OpCats system.

The second issue on the agenda was **Item 1325: Hand Dig**. The proposed revised verbiage for this item was approved at the Board meeting which met earlier that morning. Therefore, this item is now closed.

The final topic of discussion was Item 1300: Pole set in same hole. This item was approved at the March Board meeting; however, Mr. Ghantiwala (Mr. Ghantiwala was not in attendance, however, had raised the question at the Board meeting which had met earlier) questioned the verbiage in Authorized Costs Item 19 b) and c). The Authorized Costs and verbiage was approved as follows:

- 19. Cost for placing pole back in the same hole.**
- a) pole placement located on street without riser.....\$700**
 - b) pole placement located on street with riser.....\$850**
 - c) pole placement on rear property with or without riser.....\$1000**

The concern Mr. Ghantiwala has with the language in the above referenced item is that it does not specify the riser owner's accountability. Ms. Hernandez stated that regardless of ownership, a riser on a pole must be addressed because a pole with a riser is labor intensive, and to insert

verbiage addressing riser ownership would further complicate issues. The members discussed this issue extensively and agreed that the approved verbiage was clear and correct. They further agreed that the interpretation is meant to address all and any risers on a pole regardless of ownership. It was unanimous that there was no need to revise this item any further.

Ms. Hernandez stated as a reminder to the Routine Revision Committee that any future revisions would reflect the revision date in parenthesis next to the section number.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m. until May 15, 2002.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

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

August 21, 2002

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 1:45 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Robert Allen - City of Los Angeles
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Dan Lewis - Verizon California
Mr. Ernie Solorzano – Southern California Water
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Cory Autrey – Sprint PCS
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Mr. Malcolm Brown called the meeting to order at 1:50 p.m. The first item on the agenda was **Item 1235: Cost Causer**. This item is contingent on the implementation of the OpCats system.

The second issue on the agenda was **Item 1331: Section 3.4 (City of Anaheim)**. Mr. Brown explained that the issue Mr. Santiago has with this section is it does not address existing risers, it appears to concern new risers only. Anaheim would like verbiage added to address the relocation of existing risers and the costs to be shared among joint owners. Ms. Dell stated that the members would like to hear from Mr. Santiago for his interpretation and clarification. Mr. Santiago was not in attendance. Mr. Brown stated that Anaheim is undergoing an extensive pole replacement program. Mr. Brown suggested the members review the section in regards to Mr. Santiago's issue and be prepared to discuss this further at the next Routine Revision meeting.

The third item on the agenda was **Item 1333: Section 10.8**. Mr. Autrey brought this issue to the table. He is of the opinion that Section 18.1D should apply to this section. The members discussed this issue extensively. It was agreed that the last sentence in the section be removed. This item will be on the Discussion Calendar of the September Board meeting.

The last item on the agenda was Miscellaneous Items. Mr. Lewis stated that he recalls the members discussing the issue of pole loading and that Section 3.0 would address pole loading. The members stated that they remember discussing this and had decided not to address pole-loading issues in the Routine or any other GO 95 orders.

The meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m. until September 18, 2002.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

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

September 18, 2002

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

Mr. Larry Chow - Verizon California
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Cory Autrey – Sprint PCS
Mr. June Santiago – City of Anaheim
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Chairperson, Ms. Lynn Prescott called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m. The first item on the agenda was **Item 1235: Cost Causer**. This item is contingent on the implementation of the OpCats system.

The second issue on the agenda was **Item 1331: Section 3.4 (City of Anaheim)**. Ms. Prescott asked Mr. Santiago to share with the Committee his concerns with this section. Mr. Santiago stated that the verbiage in this section does not address relocation of existing risers when replacing poles, it addresses only relocation of new risers on pole replacement. He further stated that the City of Anaheim is currently concentrating on a pole replacement program, and he is encountering cost problems with existing risers. He reported that the current risers are 2” risers, and 4” risers will replace them. This is proving costly to Anaheim. Ms. Dell then inquired as to why Anaheim was replacing the poles. She stated that the initiating member must bear the total cost of replacing a pole when it is for the sole benefit of the initiating party. Ms. Dell further stated that it appears that the City of Anaheim is asking the members to share the cost of replacement, when it is not a mutual benefit, the benefit is for Anaheim only. She stated that Anaheim could enter into a special agreement with a member, and agree to share the cost, however, in her opinion, she could not understand why any member would pay for work that is not beneficial to them. The members discussed this issue at length, and agreed that there is no need to add verbiage to address existing risers. This issue is closed.

The third item on the agenda was **Item 1333: Section 10.8**. This item was approved and closed at the September 18, 2002 meeting.

There were no miscellaneous items discussed at this meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m. until October 16, 2002.

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

October 16, 2002

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 11:50 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Dan Lewis - Verizon California
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles
Mr. Ernie Solorzano - Southern California Edison
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Cory Autrey – Sprint PCS
Mr. Sean Matlock – So. California Water
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Chairperson, Ms. Lynn Prescott called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m. The first item on the agenda was **Item 1235: Cost Causer**. This item is contingent on the implementation of the OpCats system.

The second item on the agenda was **Item 1333: Section 10.8**. This item was approved and closed at the September 18, 2002 meeting. However, at the request of SBC, this issue has been reopened for discussion. Ms. Prouty stated that upon returning to her office, and further discussing the issue with her engineers and peers, she has reconsidered her vote for approval. She is of the opinion that the sentence that was deleted from Section 10.8, should be reinstated. Ms. Prouty reported that her organization is encountering problems with the transfer of equipment. Her organization is receiving JPAs that have been final billed, but upon inspection of the location, the work has not been completed. Ms. Prouty addressed Mr. Solorzano requesting that JPAs not be final billed, until the work has been completed. Mr. Solorzano responded stating that it appears to be an issue regarding SBC and Edison. Therefore, he requested from Ms. Prouty some examples of this situation. Upon receiving the examples, Mr. Solorzano will meet with the parties within his organization to discuss, and work toward resolving the problem. Ms. Prouty agreed to furnish Mr. Solorzano with examples by the first of the following month.

Ms. Hernandez stated that she believes the intent of inserting the sentence, “*Section 18.1-D does not apply*”, to Section 10.8, was in reference to rearrangement of facilities. The intention was to ensure that the other joint owner agrees to the rearrangement of their facilities. Mr. Solorzano stated that perhaps a separate section should be created in order to differentiate between the transfer and rearrangement of facilities.

It was agreed that this issue would require an item number for further discussion. **Item 1337: Section 10.8 Revisited**, has been assigned to this issue.

There were no miscellaneous items discussed at this meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m. until November 20, 2002.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

November 20, 2002

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 11:30 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Dan Lewis - Verizon California
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena
Mr. J. Craig Wayment – Altrio Communications
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Cory Autrey – Sprint PCS
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Ms. Prouty opened the meeting by addressing **Item 1337: Section 10.8 Revisited**. This item was approved by the Board, and closed at the September 18, 2002 meeting. However, at the request of SBC, this issue has been reopened for discussion. Ms. Prouty stated that she had researched Section 10.8, and discovered that Mr. Lewis had suggested inserting the verbiage, “*Section 18.1-D does not apply*”, to Section 10.8. Therefore, it appears that Verizon California had a concern with this section.

Ms. Prouty cited a situation of a five party JPA, where only two parties were involved in Section 10.8 and did respond in a timely manner, however, the remaining three parties did not respond within the required time frame. Thus, preventing the JPA from being finalized. Ms. Prouty suggested inserting additional verbiage to Section 10.8 stating as such, “*The necessity for having a reference to Section 18.1-D under this section (Section 10.8 therefore, does not require any other utility/tenant to respond if they have no action involvement). The JPA should reflect the presence of these other utilities/tenants and should be marked as having no involvement in the blocked designated as location and nature or work.*” She then shared a Section 10.8 JPA with the members that reflected a JPA that had been finalized, but the work had not been done. She stated that a Section 10.8 JPA should not be finalized unless the work has been done. Therefore, she is of the opinion that by reinstating the last sentence to the section (which states, “Section 18.1-D does not apply”), would prevent the above-mentioned situation. She further stated that perhaps adding verbiage to Section 10.8 that would allow the initiating party to finalize a JPA via Section 18.1-D for those parties not involved in the transferring or rearranging of facilities.

The members agreed that verbiage should be added to Section 10.8 to address this issue. It was agreed to discuss this item further at the next Routine Revision meeting in order to agree on the best language to address this item. Upon their return, the members agreed to offer their suggestions on the correct additional verbiage for Section 10.8.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m. until January 15, 2003.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager