

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

February 19, 2003

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. Dan Lewis - Verizon California
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Mr. Randall Starkkry – Adelphia Communications
Mr. David Filson – City of Burbank
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles
Mr. Mahendra Garg – City of Anaheim
Mr. June Santiago– City of Anaheim
Mr. Manuel Ponce – Cingular Wireless
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Cory Autrey – Sprint PCS
Ms. Jean Baccus - Committee Staff

Mr. Brown opened the meeting by addressing **Item 1337: Section 10.8 Revisited.** The members discussed this section and the previous dates and revisions to Section 10.8. Ms. Prouty stated that the problem her organization is encountering is the inability to approve JPAs prior to JPA finalization. What is needed is verbiage stressing the significance that the issuing party must not act without approval from the other participating parties on the JPA. Ms. Prouty further stated that another concern of SBC is that they do not want other parties transferring their equipment. She believes the original purpose of Section 10.8 is to prevent the transfer of equipment without approval. Mr. Brown proposed inserting “written or verbal” between the opening words in the section, “Upon approval”. This would ensure that equipment could not be transferred without proper approval from the other parties involved. It was agreed that this item be put on the Discussion calendar of the March Board meeting with the above mentioned word insertion.

The next issue on the agenda was **Item 1342: Tennis shoes on Wires.** This issue was brought to the table by DWP. Mr. Allen was not present; however, the members are of the opinion that Mr. Allen would like discussion on whom should be accountable for removing shoes from wires. It was stated that perhaps the responsible party for removing shoes on wires, should be the party whose wire the shoes are on. It was decided to leave this item open until the return of Mr. Allen.

Mr. Lewis stated that the Single Trip to Pole ad hoc committee should schedule a meeting in March. Ms. Prouty, who is the Chair for Single Trip to Pole, agreed with Mr. Lewis. It was decided that Single Trip would meet on March 19, 2003 following the Board and other ad hoc meetings.

Mr. Walls stated that Section 2.1 of the Routine Handbook was not in line with the Authorized Costs. He further stated that Section 2.1 refers to a per-foot cost, and the cost for removing a pole from service is now a flat rate. The members decided to assign an item number to the review of the Routine for accuracy. Item 1343: Routine Review will be on the next agenda for discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m. until March 19, 2003.

Jean Baccus, Assistant Office Manager

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE
437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone (909) 592-4001
Fax (909) 592-4636

March 27, 2003

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 10:00 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles
Mr. June Santiago– City of Anaheim
Mr. Manuel Ponce – Cingular Wireless
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting by addressing **Item 1337: Section 10.8 Revisited**. Ms. Prouty stated that SBC is concerned that members, especially those new to the Committee, would apply automatic approval to this section, if it lacks stating that Section 18.1 does not apply. She is of the opinion, that if it does not state in the Routine that 18.1 cannot be applied to any particular section, members could use automatic approval after 45 days. Ms. Prouty further stated that she would like the verbiage, “Section 18.1D does not apply,” reinstated to this section, to ensure that there is communication among members in regards to this section. After discussion, the members agreed on verbiage to be added to the section. The proposed verbiage is as follows; “Section 18.1D will not apply to the members being rearranged, or transferred. Other members party to this JPA, not being rearranged or transferred, Section 18.1D will apply”. This item will be on the Discussion calendar of the April Board meeting.

The members discussed inserting a definition of how revisions are noted in the Routine. This definition would be in the glossary section of the Routine. Ms. Corella will work on the definition for glossary.

The next issue on the agenda was **Item 1342: Tennis shoes on Wires**. Mr. Allen (DWP) brought this issue to the table; therefore, it was decided to discuss this at the next meeting he attends.

The third issue on the agenda was **Item 1343: Routine Review**. Section 2 of the Routine (Billing Directives) was the first section reviewed by the members. Mr. Walls noted that this section refers to the pulling, transporting, and disposing of poles as a per pole length cost. According to Authorized Costs, the costs are per pole, regardless of length. He distributed a copy to the section with the proposed addition, and deletion of verbiage (see attachment). The members agreed to let the Committee staff review the revisions for accuracy

The next section discussed was Section 5.0-C. It was decided to have the Committee billing staff to review this section for accuracy.

The next topic of discussion was **Item 1345: New Member JPA Volume.** Ms. Hernandez stated that she would like new members to understand that if a fellow member encounters difficulty in responding to their initiating JPAs, that the 45-day rule is not set in concrete. Therefore, the responding members have the right to extend the 45-day rule, if they find the volume to too great to handle effectively. Ms. Prescott suggested that upon Board approval, new members must attend the following Board meeting to discuss issues such as JPA volume. She further suggested that if they are unable to attend the Board, that a special meeting should be scheduled. Ms. Hernandez stated that this issue should be mentioned in the letter of approval sent to new members. Ms. Goetz stated that the new member representative, construction manager, and engineering manager should be present at the special meeting to discuss and understand field issues. The members agreed that an orientation meeting should be a requirement for new members.

Under miscellaneous items the members discussed the member lack of attendance. According to the Agreement, members have an obligation to actively participate in the Board meetings. They briefly discussed the topic of enforcement of meeting participation.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m. until April 23, 2003.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

2.0 Scope

Contained in this section are definitions and conventions used within the Routine Handbook. These definitions and conventions explain terms and situations encountered in the division of costs for the joint ownership of utility poles.

Also cited are billing directives intended to provide the Committee billing office with methods for pricing transactions between Members.

2.1 Authorized Costs

These costs are made a part of the Routine. In addition to schedules of structural and salvage values, pulling and transportation, they represent the average unit costs for all Members involving transactions of any nature affected by joint ownership, covering rights of way obtained without monetary consideration to grantor or property owner, maintenance operations, transfer, rearrangement, installation of facilities and equipment jointly owned, which includes guy wires, anchors, sidewalk fixtures, crossarms pole guards or other items of a similar character.

Where it is found that a schedule price is not sufficient for a specific transaction, or where a certain structural unit is not provided for in the schedule, the Members concerned may fix a price mutually agreeable to them or may agree to undertake work on actual cost basis. Joint Pole Authorization shall show such transaction as "Special Agreement." (See Section 1.2)

In all cases where Authorized Costs are involved, the Joint Pole Authorization shall specify item number and number of items, so as to facilitate checking by Members concerned.

Labor costs may be increased by special agreement for emergency operations, or for compensation of employee working in excess of eight hours in any one day.

A. Pulling

Pulling charges are specified in Item 5, Authorized Costs. These charges are based per pole on length of pole and are prorated in accordance with Section 2.1C. ~~Where pole is broken or otherwise damaged, pulling shall be based on full length. Where pole is topped by one Member and removed by another Member, pulling shall be based on actual length.~~ For a pole not included in the joint pole schedule, such as steel poles, pulling cost shall be determined by mutual agreement.

Full pulling cost applies where a non-owner is authorized to pull pole. ~~The lowering by such non-owner of the upper section of a pole, which has been cut at the ground line, is at pulling cost based on the pole's actual length.~~

B. Transportation

Transportation charges are specified in Authorized Costs. These charges are based per pole, and prorated in accordance with Section 2.1C. ~~on actual length of pole being transported. Where pole is broken or otherwise damaged, transportation shall be based on full length. Where pole is topped by one Member and removed by another Member, transporting shall be based on actual length after cutting.~~

Full transportation cost applies where a non-owner is authorized to transport pole to yard of salvaging Member. ~~The transporting by such non-owner of the upper section of a pole, which has been cut at the ground line, is at full transportation cost, based on the actual length after cutting.~~

C. Proration of Charges for Pulling, Transporting, & Disposing

The charges for pulling, transporting, and disposing ~~all size~~ poles shall be prorated equally based on the number of owners on a pole. ~~The charges for transporting and disposing all size poles shall be equally prorated for common footage and prorated proportionate to ownership based on the price per foot concept for actual remaining footage.~~ (See Item 5 of Authorized Costs)

2.2 Pole Prices

Pole prices for structural and salvage values may be changed annually if deemed necessary. All Member utilities shall submit pole costs to the Joint Pole Committee office on or before October 1; and upon investigation and analysis of these costs, the Administrative Board shall fix the prices which shall become effective on the first day of January following.

2.3 Schedules for Structural and Salvage Values

Revised schedules showing percentages for accrued depreciation are made a part of the routine.

2.4 Structural Value of Pole

Structural value shall be total costs erected, including cost F.O.B. pole yard, transportation, handling, digging, erecting, supply expense, overhead and administrative expense, less accrued depreciation.

A. Minimum Structural Value

Minimum structural value shall be 40% of the cost of new pole erected. This minimum shall

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

May 1, 2003

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 9:15 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Ernie Solorzano – Southern California Edison
Mr. Dan Lewis – Verizon California
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Mr. Manuel Ponce – Cingular Wireless
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Cory Autrey – Sprint PCS
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting by addressing **Item 1337: Section 10.8 Revisited**. At the prior Administrative Board meeting, it was agreed to table this issue. Since, SCE and SBC both have a major concern with this item; it will remain open contingent on an agreement between the two members.

The next issue on the agenda was **Item 1342: Tennis shoes on Wires**. Mr. Allen reported that this issue has the attention of Mayor Hahn. When DWP receives a customer complaint to remove tennis shoes from wires, DWP must respond immediately. He states that his organization must absorb the cost of sending a crew out to the location to remove the shoes. He is proposing that, this cost be shared by the joint owners on the poles. He further stated that he is not sure who is responsible for removing the shoes. Mr. Solorzano stated that in his opinion, if the shoes on the wires do not disrupt customer service, the other utilities might not respond. Mr. Prouty agreed, stating that in brief discussions with her superiors on this issue, they stated that if there is no disruption of service, it is very likely they would not respond. However, Ms. Prouty stated that she would discuss this further with her superiors. Mr. Lewis stated that he would also research this issue upon returning to his organization, and would have some information for DWP upon his return. Ms. Dell stated that DWP should not absorb the costs alone; however, she inquired as to how DWP intended on collecting the costs. Ms. Prouty stated that this issue could fall under “pole obstruction”. Mr. Solorzano stated that “pole obstruction” is a general statement, however, it normally refers to ivy. Mr. Lewis reiterated that he would require within his organization as to whether they would consider sharing the cost of shoe removal. Mr. Allen stated that upon his return next month, he would have the costs for the removal of shoes from wires.

The third issue on the agenda was **Item 1343: Routine Review**. The members agreed that the proposed revisions to Section 2, (see attachment) be put on the Consent Calendar of the May Board meeting agenda. In regards to reviewing the entire Routine Handbook, the

consensus was to distribute the sections among the members present. The distribution goes as follows:

Sections 1, and 3	SBC
Sections 4, and 5	AT&T Wireless
Sections 7, and 8	Verizon California
Sections 9, and 10	City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Sections 11, and 12	Verizon Wireless
Sections 13, and 14	Sprint PCS
Sections 15, and 16	City of Pasadena
Sections 17, through 20	Southern California Edison

The target date sent to complete review of the above sections is by the July Routine Revision meeting.

Ms. Corella reported that she created an explanation for revisions to the Routine in the glossary, per the request of SCE at the previous Routine meeting. Ms. Corella distributed a copy with section G added as definition of revisions(see attachment). It was decided that this additional section be on the Consent Calendar of the next meeting.

The next topic of discussion was **Item 1345: New Member JPA Volume.** Mr. Solorzano opened the discussion by stating that, in the past, SBC has addressed this issue directly with RCN. He further stated that when SCE received a large volume of JPAs from RCN, they did not have the workforce to respond in the allotted time. In his opinion, there should be a limit on the amount of work submitted by new members upon immediate membership. Mr. Lewis responded that in his opinion, you couldn't place a specific number on the volume of work initiated by a member. Mr. Solorzano further stated that, perhaps this issue could be handled through a meeting between the new member, and the existing member experiencing the sudden large volume of workload. Ms. Dell and Mr. Lewis agreed with Mr. Solorzano, that scheduling a meeting to discuss concerns regarding workload issues is a reasonable solution. Mr. Solorzano inquired if, the present members, felt that adding verbiage to an existing section addressing JPA volume would prove of value. Currently, the Routine does not state that an initiating member should accommodate the receiving member by allowing a time extension to respond to a JPA. Mr. Lewis stated that Section 18 should address the issue of time frames that cannot be met. SCE, SBC and Verizon California stated that they would work on language that would address extension requests on JPA time frames/limits.

Under miscellaneous items Mr. Lewis reported a situation concerning costs of pole set in same hole. He received a call from his Lancaster office stating that, the caller was charged a pulling cost, along with placing a pole in the same hole cost. Mr. Lewis stated that SCE would investigate if pulling charges were inclusive in the pole set in same hole costs.

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m. until May 22, 2003.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

(attachments)

BILLING DIRECTIVES

2.0 Scope

Contained in this section are definitions and conventions used within the Routine Handbook. These definitions and conventions explain terms and situations encountered in the division of costs for the joint ownership of utility poles.

Also cited are billing directives intended to provide the Committee billing office with methods for pricing transactions between Members.

2.1 Authorized Costs

These costs are made a part of the Routine. In addition to schedules of structural and salvage values, pulling and transportation, they represent the average unit costs for all Members involving transactions of any nature affected by joint ownership, covering rights of way obtained without monetary consideration to grantor or property owner, maintenance operations, transfer, rearrangement, installation of facilities and equipment jointly owned, which includes guy wires, anchors, sidewalk fixtures, crossarms pole guards or other items of a similar character.

Where it is found that a schedule price is not sufficient for a specific transaction, or where a certain structural unit is not provided for in the schedule, the Members concerned may fix a price mutually agreeable to them or may agree to undertake work on actual cost basis. Joint Pole Authorization shall show such transaction as "Special Agreement." (See Section 1.2)

In all cases where Authorized Costs are involved, the Joint Pole Authorization shall specify item number and number of items, so as to facilitate checking by Members concerned.

Labor costs may be increased by special agreement for emergency operations, or for compensation of employee working in excess of eight hours in any one day.

A. Pulling

Pulling charges are specified in Item 5, Authorized Costs. These charges are based per pole on length of pole and are prorated in accordance with Section 2.1C. ~~Where pole is broken or otherwise damaged, pulling shall be based on full length. Where pole is topped by one Member and removed by another Member, pulling shall be based on actual length.~~ For a pole not included in the joint pole schedule, such

as steel poles, pulling cost shall be determined by mutual agreement.

Full pulling cost applies where a non-owner is authorized to pull pole. ~~The lowering by such non-owner of the upper section of a pole, which has been cut at the ground line, is at pulling cost based on the pole's actual length.~~

B. Transportation

Transportation charges are specified in Authorized Costs. These charges are based per pole, and prorated in accordance with Section 2.1C. ~~on actual length of pole being transported. Where pole is broken or otherwise damaged, transportation shall be based on full length. Where pole is topped by one Member and removed by another Member, transporting shall be based on actual length after cutting.~~

Full transportation cost applies where a non-owner is authorized to transport pole to yard of salvaging Member. ~~The transporting by such non-owner of the upper section of a pole, which has been cut at the ground line, is at full transportation cost, based on the actual length after cutting.~~

C. Proration of Charges for Pulling, Transporting, & Disposing

The charges for pulling, transporting, and disposing ~~all size~~ poles shall be prorated equally based on the number of owners on a pole. ~~The charges for transporting and disposing all size poles shall be equally prorated for common footage and prorated proportionate to ownership based on the price per foot concept for actual remaining footage.~~ (See Item 5 of Authorized Costs)

2.2 Pole Prices

Pole prices for structural and salvage values may be changed annually if deemed necessary. All Member utilities shall submit pole costs to the Joint Pole Committee office on or before October 1; and upon investigation and analysis of these costs, the Administrative Board shall fix the prices which shall become effective on the first day of January following.

2.3 Schedules for Structural and Salvage Values

Revised schedules showing percentages for accrued depreciation are made a part of the routine.

2.4 Structural Value of Pole

Structural value shall be total costs erected, including cost F.O.B. pole yard, transportation, handling, digging, erecting, supply expense, overhead and administrative expense, less accrued depreciation.

A. Minimum Structural Value

Minimum structural value shall be 40% of the cost of new pole erected. This minimum shall

GLOSSARY

DEFINITIONS

A. Locations For Replacement Poles:

(1) Hard-North(South/East/West): Setting a new pole against the existing pole in the direction specified.

(2) One foot (any direction): Setting a replacement pole a specified number of feet (any direction) measured face to face.

(3) Same area: Designated general area for pole placement when the exact final location is not critical.

(4) Same hole: Setting a replacement pole in the same hole as the original pole.

B. Property Line - North (South/East/West)

Designates that line separating different properties or the perimeter of an owned property. The direction is viewed from the pole access location. (See Section 15.4)

C. Service Drops

Service drops are the conductors between the building or structure served and the adjacent line pole. (See Section 11.0)

D. Pole Space

(1) Safety Clearance Zone: Jointly owned vertical pole space required by General Order 95 to safely separate facilities in alignment with Section 19.2

(2) Encroachable Safety Zone: Portion of the Safety Clearance Zone which may be purchased when allowed in accordance with General Order 95 after taking the appropriate safety precautions. (See Section 4.3, 19.2)

(3) Supporting Structure Space: Supporting structure space is that jointly owned vertical pole space below the lowest attached line or cable.

(4) Common Area or Shared Space or Non-Useable Footage: Includes Safety Clearance Zone, Pole Butt, and Supporting Structure Space. This space can be used for the placement of risers, guys, switches, metering equipment, or other items that comply with General Order 95.

(5) Useable Space: Vertical pole space specifically available to a Member for placement of their facilities, or portions of the Encroachable Safety Zone which have been properly occupied in accordance with Sections 4.3 and 19.2.

E. Equipment

(1) Terminal: A fused termination point that connects communication conductors to service drop(s).

(2) GUYS

(a) Span Guy: All overhead guys (pole to pole, arm to arm, arm to pole.)

(b) Down Guy: Guy connected from pole to anchor rod.

F. Approved Maintenance Program

An Approved Maintenance Program will be one that was presented to the Administrative Board, and approved through the normal voting process, as outlined in the current Agreement.

G. Revisions

Changes in Routine Handbook sections and Authorized Costs. Date changes will be noted in parenthesis following text, or cost changes, additions, or deletions.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

May 22, 2003

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:

Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Barbara Saito – Nextel Communications
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Cory Autrey – Sprint PCS
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting by addressing **Item 1337: Section 10.8 Revisited.** SBC will meet with Edison, to address the specific issues pertaining to this item. Therefore, this item will remain open, pending on SBC and Edison.

The next issue on the agenda was **Item 1342: Tennis shoes on Wires.** Mr. Allen reported that the City of Los Angeles have collected approximately, 1000 pairs of shoes from wires. Currently, the City of Los Angeles is dispatching crews to the locations to remove shoes. What Mr. Allen would like to propose, is an Authorized Cost for shoe removal. He further stated that the shoes are usually on cable TV, or communications wires. However, they do not respond in regards to tennis shoe removal. Since the shoes are on DWP poles, they are the first contacted by private citizens. The only concern the Mayor of Los Angeles has, is removal of the shoes from the wires as quickly as possible. Mr. Allen further stated that, regardless of whose wires the shoes are on, the City of Los Angeles must respond to the request of its citizens. To reiterate, Mr. Allen would like to propose an Authorized Cost to relieve DWP of the entire cost of dispatching a crew to remove shoes from wires.

The third issue on the agenda was **Item 1343: Routine Review.** At the previous Routine meeting, the members were assigned sections of the Routine Handbook to review. They are reviewing for consistency, and accuracy. The target date set to complete this assignment is the July Routine Revision meeting.

The next topic of discussion was **Item 1345: New Member JPA Volume.** This issue is in conjunction with Item 1343: Routine Review. Section 18 should address JPA volume. SCE has been assigned Section 18 of the Routine Handbook, and create the verbiage to address JPA volume.

The final issue on the agenda was **Item 1348: Pulling Charges Related to Section 7.4.** At the previous Routine meeting, Mr. Lewis questioned when setting a pole in the same hole (Authorized Cost 19), should there be a pulling charge (Authorized Cost 5.A) included. Ms.

Hernandez stated that, she is of the opinion when Authorized Cost Item 19 was created, the pulling was not inclusive. Therefore, she believes that both charges should apply, however, the Routine Revision meeting minutes that created Section 19 should be reviewed for certainty. This issue will be discussed further at the next Routine meeting, along with PB-LTD.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m. until June 18, 2003.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

September 16, 2003

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:

Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Mr. Ernie Solorzano – Southern California Edison
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena
Mr. Doug Schmaderder – City of Pasadena
Mr. Randall Starkey – Adelfia Communications
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Mr. Tony Mai – City of Glendale
Mr. Dan Lewis – Verizon California
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Cory Autrey – Sprint PCS
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Mr. Brown opened that meeting at 9:05 am. The first issue on the agenda was **Item 1352: Form 48 Review for iPole**. Review of Form 48 by the Routine Committee is to ensure that the operations on the form are applicable today, and if any operations need to be added prior to programming it for iPole. Ms. Prescott stated that all the operations on the form should be addressed and noted as billing directives or notations only. The members reviewed and discussed the form per line item prior to the arrival of Mr. Atalla at 10:00 am. They are as follows:

1. Change removal agreement to: ~~—————~~ → = billing and notification
- ~~2. Pole has been replaced; transfer should be made. = billing and notification~~
(**New verbiage: Changes due to field condition.**)
3. ~~Pole has been set; attachment should be made. = notification only~~
(2 and 3 combined to read: Pole has been set/replaced; attachment/transfer should be made.)
4. Lower top; butt has been pulled. = notification only
5. Pull entire pole. = notification only
6. ~~Pole Pulled~~ = **deleted**
7. ~~Top lowered~~ = **deleted**
8. ~~Pull pole and transport to yard of salvaging utility at address specified. = **deleted**~~
9. ~~Our~~ transfer has been completed; pole may be pulled. = notification only
10. Solely owned pole to be removed. Remove within 48 hours and notify us by telephone of completion, confirming on Form 48. = notification only
11. Make your temporary attachments permanent on new pole. = notification only
- ~~12. Pole has been removed; make your attachments permanent. = **deleted**~~

13. Pole has been straightened; make your attachments permanent. = notification only
14. Anchor has been installed; attachments should be make. = notification only
15. Anchor has been replaced; transfer guy and remove old rod. = notification only
16. Make sidewalk and pavement repairs. = billing and notification
17. Our attachments have been removed; pole may be renumbered. = billing and notification
18. Clearing of construction is necessary as noted below. Inform us when completed. = notification only
19. All work completed. = notification only
20. Work completed ONLY on poles listed below. = notification only
21. Pole topped _____ feet. = billing and notification

The members discussed Form 48 with Mr. Atalla for clarification. Mr. Atalla stated that he would incorporate Form 48 into the current proposal/agreement for database clean up, and Form's 2 and 7. He further stated that he would contact Ms. Corella via e-mail with the revised Proposal/Agreement, which would now include the Form 48 as well. When Ms. Corella receives the revision, she would then send it to the members for their review. This item is now considered closed.

The second issue on the agenda was **Item 1337: Section 10.8 Revisited**. Ms. Prouty is of the opinion that this section should separate the language when referring to transferring and rearranging facilities. Ms. Dell requested a refresher on this issue. Ms. Prouty stated that she wanted the verbiage, "Section 18.1D does not apply" reinstated to this section. The Board approved removal of the sentence at the September 2002 meeting. However, if the issue of transfer and rearrangement were separated into two sections, than, perhaps this would resolve the problem. The primary concern for Ms. Prouty is that SBC is notified before Edison transfers any of their facilities. Ms. Solorzano stated that SBC and Verizon have an agreement as to what Edison is allowed to transfer. Ms. Prouty requested that Edison; SBC and their counterparts in the north discuss this issue for clarification via a conference call. This issue will remain open until Edison and SBC arrive at a resolution.

The next issue on the agenda was **Item 1342: Tennis shoes on Wires**. Mr. Allen reported that the City of Los Angeles continues to receive calls to remove tennis shoes from wires. He further stated that the shoes are never on DWP wires, but on communication wires. The members agreed that power wires are so high, that they are unreachable. Ms. Prouty reported that she has spoken to those in authority and responsible for such issues. The response from SBC is that unless the shoes are disrupting service to SBC customers they would not get involved. Mr. Allen stated that he is in the process of assessing the costs of responding to calls for the removal of shoes. Upon his return next month, Mr. Allen should have more information as well as the costs of dispatching a crew to remove the shoes. This item is to remain open at this time.

The fourth issue on the agenda was **Item 1343: Routine Review**. At the previous Routine meeting, the members were assigned sections of the Routine Handbook to review. They are reviewing for consistency, and accuracy. Mr. Brown read the members and the sections they have been assigned. Mr. Lewis suggested that the members get their assigned sections showing the proposed changes to Ms. Corella by a specific date. Ms. Corella then would compile the information into one document for ease of review by the Committee. The deadline set for submitting the proposed revisions to Ms. Corella is October 1st. A meeting for the revision of the sections of the Handbook was scheduled for Thursday October 16, 2003.

The next topic of discussion was **Item 1345: New Member JPA Volume.** Ms. Dell reminded that members that they could not place a number on the volume of JPAs submitted by incoming members. To do so would be to also limit existing members. Mr. Brown responded that incoming members would need to gauge what the Committee considers a large volume. Ms. Corella suggested moving this issue to Re-organization, because it could be related to **Item 1347: New Member Application Process.** In the approval letter, and during the interview, the members should stress to the applicants the problems created by inundating existing members with a large volume of JPAs. Since it has been agreed that the Committee cannot place a fixed number on the JPAs members are allowed to submit per month, this issue does not belong in Routine. It was agreed to re-assign this item to the Reorganization Committee.

The sixth issue on the agenda was **Item 1348: Pulling Charges Related to Section 7.4.** Mr. Lewis brought this issue to the table. His question is when setting a pole in the same hole (Authorized Cost 19), should there be a pulling charge (Authorized Cost 5.A) included. Mr. Cox stated that it appears that pulling charges are not included. When setting a pole in the same pole, it usually requires two separate crews. Mr. Lewis stated that he was uncertain about the charges, however, he is now satisfied and agrees that this type of construction does requires both charges. This item is now closed.

The last concern on the agenda was **Item 1259: Approved Contractors List.** It was agreed that Ms. Corella contact the Members and request a current list of their approved contractors. Ms. Corella would set a cut-off date for the lists.

Under miscellaneous items Ms. Goetz stated that when there is a Form 44 **monetary correction required**, should it be corrected in current month, or should it be corrected in the month where the transaction occurred. The consensus is that it should be corrected it the prior period in which it occurred.

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m. until October 16, 2003.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

October 16, 2003

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:

Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Mr. Ernie Solorzano – Southern California Edison
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless
Mr. Dan Lewis – Verizon California
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Cory Autrey – Sprint PCS
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Ms Prescott opened that meeting at 9:10 am. The first issue discussed by the members was **Item 1337: Section 10.8 Revisited.** Ms. Prouty requested that this item remain open at this time, pending on a meeting between SBC and SCE.

The next issue for discussion was **Item 1342: Tennis shoes on Wires.** Ms. Prescott reported that at the last meeting, Mr. Allen agreed to obtain the costs resulting from removing shoes from wires. Mr. Allen was not in attendance, therefore, it was agreed that this item remain open until the return of Mr. Allen.

The fourth issue on the agenda was **Item 1343: Routine Review.** At a previous Routine meeting, the members were assigned sections of the Routine Handbook to review for accuracy. The members were ready to discuss issues, and/or changes to their respective assigned sections with the Committee. The members reviewed and discussed the sections extensively. The **attachment** reflects what issues and/or changes the Committee agreed upon. The City of Los Angeles and the City of Pasadena were not in attendance; therefore, their sections are pending.

The Committee then invited Mr. Atalla to discuss his revised Proposal/Contract. Mr. Atalla stated that he has incorporated Form 48 into the new proposal at no cost to the Committee. He explained the functions for Form 48, and stated that without this process in the system at this phase, the program would not be able to move forward. He further stated that he invested three weeks perfecting this process and he believes that the Committee should be pleased with the result. Upon the signing of the revised contract/proposal, Mr. Atalla and his team would begin the tasks outlined in the contract.

Ms. Hernandez raised a concern with **Section 13.1.** She stated that in her opinion this section is used for corrections to final bill. She is encountering JPAs to correct field conditions, and do not state/reflect a *Shown as* and *Should be* statements, and the specifics of the corrections are missing. She stated in her opinion that this section should not be used for corrections of field conditions. Mr. Autrey directed the members to Section 18, page 18-8 for an example. Ms.

Hernandez further stated that she is receiving correction of record JPAs with minimal information on what is being corrected. This proves difficult in that Ms. Hernandez is not certain what the proposed corrections are. Mr. Autrey stated that there are instances when a correction may be handled through the JPC office. A typo correction is one example of JPC office correction, but correction in grade and space must be handled via a JPA. The members reviewed Section 13, and agreed that this section requires further review.

The Committee will continue to work on Item 1343: Routine Revision to ensure all sections reflects how business is conducted among joint pole owners today.

Ms. Corella emailed the members requesting a current copy of their approved contractors. She is receiving lists from members. Therefore, **Item 1259: Approved Contractors List** will remain open.

Item 1353: JPA Numbering was addressed while discussing Item 1343: Routine Review. Proposed verbiage was added to Section 20. It reads as follows, "*JPA number must begin with the initiators assigned member/utility code*".

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m. until November 19, 2003.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
 Routine Revision Committee

Routine Review Status
 as of
 October 16, 2003

SECTION NO.	CHANGES Y/N	STATUS	CHANGE OR ISSUE
1.0	Yes	Approved	Change in Agreement date to "1998"
1.1	No	-	-
1.2	Yes	Open Item	Last sentence in paragraph
1.2	Yes	Approved	Add verbiage to end of paragraph "Section 18.1D does not apply"
2	No	-	-
3.1	Yes	Open Item	Re-write entire section for clarity
3.2	No	-	-
3.3	Yes	Open Item	Re-write entire section for clarity
3.4	No	-	-
3.5	No	-	-
4	No	-	-
5	No	-	-
7.0	No	-	-
7.1	Yes	Open Item	Review the cost of replacement to original owner
7.2	No	-	-
7.3	No	-	-
7.4	No	-	-
7.5	No	-	-
7.6	No	-	-
7.7	No	-	-
7.8	No	-	-
7.9	No	-	-
7.10	No	-	-
7.11	No	-	-
7.12	Yes	Open Item	New Section "Replacement of Pole due to Uncontrolled or Natural Disaster"
7.13	Yes	Open Item	New Section "Penalty for Failure to Issue Notice of Intention/Replacement"
8	No	-	-
9			PENDING DWP SUBMITTAL
10			PENDING DWP SUBMITTAL Review old section 10.13 Push Brace for possible reinstatement
11	No	-	-
12.0	Yes	Approved	Two typographical corrections were made
12.1	No	-	-
12.2	Yes	Open Item	Further review of this section
12.3	Yes	Open Item	Further review of this section
12.4	No	-	-
12.5	No	-	-
12.6	No	-	-
12.9	No	-	-

12.1	No	-	-
12.11	No	-	-
12.12	No	-	-
13.0	Yes	Open Item	Further review of this section
13.1	Yes	Open Item	Further review of this section
13.2	No	-	-
Note: Section 13 Title to change to "Correction of Record/Cancellation"			
14	No	-	-
15			PENDING CITY OF PASADENA SUBMITTAL
16			PENDING CITY OF PASADENA SUBMITTAL
17	No	-	-
18.0	No	-	-
18.1	No	-	-
18.1-A	No	-	-
18.1-B	No	-	-
18.1-C	No	-	-
18.1-D	No	-	-
18.1-E	Yes	Open Item	Further review of this section pertaining to the 60 day time limit
18.1-F	Yes	Approved	Add "Item 14" to the last sentence of paragraph one.
18.2	No	-	-
18.3	Yes	Approved	Add "along with a memo of explanation." to the second sentence of paragraph one.
18.4	No	-	-
18.5	No	-	-
18.6	No	-	-
18.7	Yes	Approved	One typographical correction was made
18.8	No	-	-
18.9	No	-	-
Example 3	Yes	Open Item	Page 18-8, Revision to sample is being revised by SCE, pending further review.
19.0	Yes	Approved	Removal of the words "or 5.3" from the last sentence of the section.
19.1	No	-	-
19.2	No	-	-
19.3	No	-	-
19.4	No	-	-
19.5	No	-	-
19.6	No	-	-
19.7	No	-	-
19.10	No	-	-
20.0	Yes	Approved	Add this sentence to the end of the section: "Joint pole authorization number must begin with initiator's assigned active member/utility code."
20.1	Yes	Approved	Change the title of 20.1 to "Member/"Utility Codes and Pole Tag Letters. Change the header of the report from Utility to "Member/Utility". Correct the GT pole tag reference to "VZ".

20.2	Yes	Approved	Correct all GT Successor Company Code references to "VZ". Add Pole tag "---GT" and the company name "GTE California" and the Successor Company Code "VZ"
20.3	No	-	-

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

November 19, 2003

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 2:15 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Mr. Ernie Solorzano – Southern California Edison
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Ms Prescott opened that meeting at 2:20 p.m. The first issue on the agenda was **Item 1259: Approved Contractor List**. Ms. Corella reported that she has received some responses. The members agreed that another notice requesting the above-mentioned list should be sent to the Board with a cut-off date of December 31, 2003.

The second issue on the agenda was **Item 1337: Section 10.8 Revisited**. It was agreed to include this issue with Item 1343: Routine Review to discuss any changes to this section during the review of the entire Routine Handbook.

The next issue for discussion was **Item 1342: Tennis shoes on Wires**. Mr. Allen requested that this item remain open at this time.

The fourth issue on the agenda was **Item 1343: Routine Review**. Ms. Prescott stated that she has created a spreadsheet (see attached) listing the Routine Handbook sections and columns showing 1) changes 2) status, and 3) changes or issues. Ms. Prescott suggested discussing the items that are in open status. The members reviewed the list. Ms. Hernandez discussed Section 1.2, the last sentence, “This section must be used when poles other than wood are placed, or replaced”. She stated that when she was the representative for SBC, her issue was that fiberglass poles were being placed, without SBC’s approval. What SBC is requesting, is notification from the setting utility, prior to setting a pole, other than wood. Ms. Dell remarked that the entire Routine Handbook is geared toward wood poles only. Mr. Solorzano remarked that prior to fiberglass poles, Section 1.2 was for items that were not billable, and had nothing to do with fiberglass poles. Ms. Hernandez stated that the two utilities should agree on whether, or not a fiberglass pole is necessary. She further stated that in many instances, she has received JPAs that have been finalized, and a fiberglass pole was placed without the option of agreeing if this type of pole is necessary. Ms. Solorzano stated that he is aware that this situation continues today. Ms. Dell remarked that as a joint member, and all members, should have the opportunity to choose to expense dollars on a fiberglass pole. Mr. Solorzano stated that the decision to place fiberglass poles is from an engineering perspective, and that this also incurs an additional expense for SCE. Ms. Prescott added that in her opinion, a utility would not set a fiberglass pole

arbitrarily, but because it was required, necessary or state mandated. She further stated that she would not disagree that the situation required a fiberglass pole. After much discussion, the members agreed that this section, which alludes to special agreement, should remain open.

Ms. Prescott suggested that for the December meeting to cover what items time would allow due to the holidays. However, would like to devote an entire day in January to Routine Handbook review. Ms. Prescott stated that if any members would like to add any changes or suggestions to the language in the Routine sections to email her with the information. She would then compile all the suggestions onto the spreadsheet.

Ms. Hernandez remarked that she would like to give her suggestions for Section 18 at this time for the record. She stated that the members no longer are using pole cards (pole record), and therefore, should be removed from the grid in Section 18.0 Record Forms. Ms. Corella stated that some members still require pole cards. It was agreed not to change the grid at this time, but change it when iPole is implemented.

Ms. Dell raised the concern with the usage of Form J.U. 50, which deals with underground construction. She stated that there are some utilities that are not notifying other members of their underground construction intentions via a J.U. 50. Mr. Solorzano inquired if Ms. Dell knew of such a situation. She responded that she has encountered such a situation, but choose not to mention any utilities at this time.

Ms. Hernandez then alluded to Section 18.1, first sentence. With regards to iPole, somewhere in the sentence the word “electronically” should be inserted. She also mentioned that Section 18.5 should also include information on arms on pole records, and she is of the opinion that this should be taken into account before iPole is launched. Ms. Hernandez then answered an earlier question in Section 18.1-E (d), and why the time limit is 60 days. She stated that a 60 day notice is required, because if a joint owner knows that the base owner intends on removing a pole, the joint owner may relinquish with a 30-day notice. In all fairness, the joint owner should share in the PTD costs; therefore, a 60-day notice is required.

Item 1353: JPA Numbering was addressed while discussing Item 1343: Routine Review. Proposed verbiage was added to Section 20. It reads as follows, “*JPA number must begin with the initiators assigned member/utility code*”. This item is now closed.

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m. until December 17, 2003.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
 Routine Revision Committee

Routine Review Status
 as of
 November 19, 2003

SECTION NO.	CHANGES Y/N	STATUS	CHANGE OR ISSUE
1.0	Yes	Approved	Change in Agreement date to "1998"
1.1	No	-	-
1.2	Yes	Open Item	Last sentence in paragraph
1.2	Yes	Approved	Add verbiage to end of paragraph "Section 18.1D does not apply"
2	No	-	-
3.1	Yes	Open Item	Re-write entire section for clarity
3.2	No	-	-
3.3	Yes	Open Item	Re-write entire section for clarity
3.4	No	-	-
3.5	No	-	-
4	No	-	-
5	No	-	-
7.0	No	-	-
7.1	Yes	Open Item	Review the cost of replacement to original owner
7.2	No	-	-
7.3	No	-	-
7.4	No	-	-
7.5	No	-	-
7.6	No	-	-
7.7	No	-	-
7.8	No	-	-
7.9	No	-	-
7.10	No	-	-
7.11	No	-	-
7.12	Yes	Open Item	New Section "Replacement of Pole due to Uncontrolled or Natural Disaster"
7.13	Yes	Open Item	New Section "Penalty for Failure to Issue Notice of Intention/Replacement"
8	No	-	-
9			PENDING DWP SUBMITTAL
10			PENDING DWP SUBMITTAL Review old section 10.13 Push Brace for possible reinstatement
11	No	-	-
12.0	Yes	Approved	Two typographical corrections were made
12.1	No	-	-
12.2	Yes	Open Item	Further review of this section
12.3	Yes	Open Item	Further review of this section
12.4	No	-	-
12.5	No	-	-
12.6	No	-	-
12.9	No	-	-

12.1	No	-	-
12.11	No	-	-
12.12	No	-	-
13.0	Yes	Open Item	Further review of this section
13.1	Yes	Open Item	Further review of this section
13.2	No	-	-
Note: Section 13 Title to change to "Correction of Record/Cancellation"			
14	No	-	-
15			PENDING CITY OF PASADENA SUBMITTAL
16			PENDING CITY OF PASADENA SUBMITTAL
17	No	-	-
18.0	No	-	-
18.1	No	-	-
18.1-A	No	-	-
18.1-B	No	-	-
18.1-C	No	-	-
18.1-D	No	-	-
18.1-E	Yes	Open Item	Further review of this section pertaining to the 60 day time limit
18.1-F	Yes	Approved	Add "Item 14" to the last sentence of paragraph one.
18.2	No	-	-
18.3	Yes	Approved	Add "along with a memo of explanation." to the second sentence of paragraph one.
18.4	No	-	-
18.5	No	-	-
18.6	No	-	-
18.7	Yes	Approved	One typographical correction was made
18.8	No	-	-
18.9	No	-	-
Example 3	Yes	Open Item	Page 18-8, Revision to sample is being revised by SCE, pending further review.
19.0	Yes	Approved	Removal of the words "or 5.3" from the last sentence of the section.
19.1	No	-	-
19.2	No	-	-
19.3	No	-	-
19.4	No	-	-
19.5	No	-	-
19.6	No	-	-
19.7	No	-	-
19.10	No	-	-
20.0	Yes	Approved	Add this sentence to the end of the section: "Joint pole authorization number must begin with initiator's assigned active member/utility code."
20.1	Yes	Approved	Change the title of 20.1 to "Member/"Utility Codes and Pole Tag Letters. Change the header of the report from Utility to "Member/Utility". Correct the GT pole tag reference to "VZ".

20.2	Yes	Approved	Correct all GT Successor Company Code references to "VZ". Add Pole tag "---GT" and the company name "GTE California" and the Successor Company Code "VZ"
20.3	No	-	-