

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE**

**437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3**

**San Dimas, CA 91773**

**Phone (909) 592-4001**

**Fax (909) 592-4636**

**January 7, 2004**

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:

Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Ernie Solorzano – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell  
Ms. Paula Haney – Verizon California  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless  
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (DWP)  
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles (DWP)  
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena  
Mr. Doug Schmaderer – City of Pasadena  
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Ms Prescott opened that meeting at 11:05 am. The first issue on the agenda was **Item 1259: Approved Contractor List.** Ms. Corella on several different occasions has requested a contractor list from members, but has received little response. Therefore, the Committee agreed to close this item at this time. Ms. Corella will create a contractor list of those submitted by the members, and get the list on the web site.

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 started the review with Section 3.1. According to the spreadsheet created by Ms. Prescott, this section recommendation is to rewrite this entire section for clarification. It appears that this section has too much verbiage, and should be reduced for clarification. This section may have been created at a time with the only utilities on poles were power and communications. Today there are the wireless, and cableTV attachments as well. The members revised the verbiage in this section.

Section 3.2 was discussed next. The section title was modified.

Sections 3.3 and 3.4 were discussed by the members, and revisions are proposed. The verbiage was changed for clarification purposes.

Mr. Walls suggested adding Section 3.10 to allude to replacement, and to be consistent with Sections 7.10, 12.10 etc. This would be discussed further.

Please see attached for the Sections discussed and the proposed revisions.

Mr. Solorzano questioned how the revisions would be implemented when the entire Routine Handbook revision is complete. Ms. Prescott responded that in her opinion the best method to publish the revisions to the Handbook, is to publish the entire Handbook at one time. She further stated that her projected time of completion should be at the end of the current year.

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m. until February 10, 2004.

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

# Item 1343: Routine Review

January 07, 2004

Existing

## 1.0 Scope

These rules cover joint pole practices, routine, and use of various forms devised to facilitate joint pole construction and to obtain accurate records promptly in accordance with the Southern California Joint Pole Agreement of January 1, 1995. Because the Committee was conceived by organizations who own poles, and has always been governed by documents which were based on that fact, there are necessary exceptions in cases where non-owners are involved. In the administration of joint ownership under the Routine, it is intended that, except for the provisions of Section 7.11 and 17.0, all owners shall participate under the same rules. Other exceptions should involve only special conditions and if any rule is considered inequitable for a specific case, it should be referred to the Administrative Board for recommendation.

## 1.2 Special Agreement

Special Agreement may be made for transactions in conflict with the Routine, provided approval is obtained therefor. Joint Pole Authorization shall clearly specify adjustment for each transaction under "Special Agreement" and the Joint Pole Committee Office shall record same as approved by Members concerned. This section must be used when poles other than wood are placed, or replaced.

## 1.0 Scope

These rules cover joint pole practices, routine, and use of various forms devised to facilitate joint pole construction and to obtain accurate records promptly in accordance with the Southern California Joint Pole Agreement of January 1, 1998. Because the Committee was conceived by organizations who own poles, and has always been ~~governed by documents which were based on that~~ fact, there are necessary exceptions in cases where non-owners are involved. In the administration of joint ownership under the Routine, it is intended that, except for the provisions of Section 7.11 and 17.0, all owners shall participate under the same rules. Other exceptions should involve only special conditions and if any rule is considered inequitable for a specific case, it should be referred to the Administrative Board for recommendation.

## 1.2 Special Agreement

Special Agreement may be made for transactions in conflict with the Routine, provided approval is obtained therefor. Joint Pole Authorization shall clearly specify adjustment for each transaction under "Special Agreement" and the Joint Pole Committee Office shall record same as approved by Members concerned. This section must be used when poles other than wood are placed, or replaced. Section 18.1D does not apply.

## 3.1 Purchase of Interest Under Notice of Intention

If constructing Member under Notice of Intention is involved in expense exceeding that required for

Proposed

its facilities when alone, purchase of interest by Member desiring to participate in future joint ownership shall be made when poles and anchors have been installed according to approved plan. Where only the associated anchorage is increased by request, purchase in the anchorage may be recorded as a prior transaction to the pole. In no case shall purchase in poles be required until attachment is needed, when length of poles has not been increased.

The cost of a push brace associated with a jointly owned pole shall be shared equally by all joint owners.

### **3.2 Penalty for Rejection of Notice of Intention**

Those Members which do not avail themselves of the opportunity presented by the Notice of Intention, and do not return the Notice of Intention within a time limit of 30 calendar days from the receipt thereof, and who subsequently desire to participate after construction or reconstruction has been completed, may be required to pay for any change necessary for joint ownership in accordance with section 7.3.

### **3.3 Penalty for Failure to Issue Notice of Intention**

If any Member places pole(s) or anchor(s) without Notice of Intention and within three years from year of installation of pole and equipment another Member requires facilities in same location, and installed pole does not adequately provide for these facilities, replacement shall be made in accordance with Section 7.11. Anchor replacements are also subject to penalty. After this three-year period there shall be no penalty for failure to issue Notice of Intention and replacement

### **3.1 Purchase of Interest Under Notice of Intention**

If constructing Member under Notice of Intention is involved in expense exceeding that required for

its **new** facilities when alone, purchase of interest by Member desiring to participate in joint ownership shall be made when poles and anchors have been installed according to approved plan.

The cost of a push brace associated with a jointly owned pole shall be shared equally by all joint owners.

### **3.2 ~~Penalty for~~ Rejection of Notice of Intention**

Those Members which do not avail themselves of the opportunity presented by the Notice of Intention, and do not return the Notice of Intention within a time limit of 30 calendar days from the receipt thereof, and who subsequently desire to participate after construction or reconstruction has been completed, may be required to pay for any change necessary for joint ownership in accordance with section 7.3.

### **3.3 ~~Penalty for~~ Failure to Issue Notice of Intention**

If any Member places pole(s) or anchor(s) without Notice of Intention (Sec.3.0) shall be subject to penalty. **During a period of three years beginning the year of installation another Member requiring facilities in the same location shall request replacement of facilities to provide for incumbent Member. All associated costs for such replacement shall be at the sole expense of the Member in offense** made in accordance with Section 7.11. Anchor replacements are also subject to penalty. After this **There shall be no expense after the** three-year period.

### **3.4 Notice of Intention to Construct Underground Facilities or Risers**

Members proposing installation of facilities can prepare and submit to all Members operating in the same area, Form J.U. 50 for underground

and Form 7 or Preliminary JPA for risers, notifying the Members of their intention to construct (See examples in Section 18). J.U. 50 can be used for all projects. Example: Bridges and river crossings or projects with estimated excessive trenching or paving cost.

**NOTE:** Section 3.4 is a non-billable section.

Members proposing installation of facilities can shall prepare and submit to all Members owners on record operating in the same area, Form J.U. 50 for underground and a Form 7 or Preliminary JPA for risers, notifying the Members of their intention to construct (See examples in Section 18). J.U. 50 can be used for all projects. Example: Bridges and river crossings or projects with estimated excessive trenching or paving cost.

- If members proposing installation of facilities is an existing owner on record, a Form 7 shall be prepared and submitted.
- If members proposing installation of facilities is not an existing owner on record, a Preliminary JPA shall be prepared and submitted.

**NOTE:** Section 3.4 is a non-billable section.

### **3.4 Notice of Intention to Construct ~~Underground Facilities or Risers~~**

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE**

**437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3**

**San Dimas, CA 91773**

**Phone (909) 592-4001**

**Fax (909) 592-4636**

**February 24, 2004**

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  
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell  
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless  
Mr. Dennis Ennis – AT&T Wireless  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless  
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (DWP)  
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles (DWP)  
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena  
Mr. Doug Schmaderer – City of Pasadena  
Ms. Jean Baccus - Committee Staff

Ms Prescott opened that meeting at 9:05 am. It was agreed to close **Item 1342: Tennis Shoes on Wires** at the request of Mr. Allen. He stated should this issue become a concern in the future, it could be given a new item number.

The next issue for discussion was **Item 1343: Routine Review**. Ms. Prescott reported that the Committee had completed Section 3 at the last meeting. She further reported that it was agreed to add Section 3.10 to the Routine Handbook, at the suggestion of Mr. Walls stating that this item is billable to the customer.

The members then reviewed Section 4. Ms. Hernandez referred to Section 4.4, and suggested adding the Authorized Costs item number to this section. The following verbiage in parenthesis were added, “See Item160 or 164”.

Ms. Dell opened discussion on Section 5.0-B Reusable Pole. This section states that the reusable pole shall be identified by pole number, and JPA number. Ms. Dell questioned if the Committee is in agreement of retaining the same pole number in these instances. After much discussion, the members agreed there is no need for changes in this section.

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion on Section 5.1-C Relinquishment – Pole Removed at Unknown Date. It was suggested to add “unknown party”. Ms. Hernandez stated the significance of noting this, is that this action is not paid to any party who could possibly claim pulling the pole. The members clarified and discussed this section, and agreed no change was necessary.

Next discussed was Section 2.1-C Proration of Charges for Pulling, Transporting, & Disposing. The members agreed to research to ensure that this Section has been approved.

The members then discussed Section 7.1 Replacement of pole for Sole Benefit of Member with Crossing Conductors Only. Ms. Prescott stated that in her opinion, Mr. Dan Lewis originally had a question in regards to the cost of replacement to the original owner. The members discussed this section. There were no changes to this section.

Mr. Cox inquired if the 24-hour emergency number list is current. Ms. Dell responded that it most likely is not. It is the responsibility of the members to contact the SCJPC office with any changes. The office manager should remind members to send her notification of any changes.

The members then discussed Section 7. It was agreed that Section 7.6, and Section 7.7 did not require any changes. It was proposed to add Section 7.12 entitled, "Replacement of Pole due to Uncontrolled or Natural Disaster." Ms. Dell reported that his issue was brought to the table by SCE, and it is driven by the labor costs incurred by SCE when responding to emergency situations. In these instances SCE must pay in labor such premium rates as double and triple time costs. Mr. Walls responded that these situations are normally handled via Section 1.2, special agreement. Ms. Hernandez will create the language for the additional Section 7.13, which would address "Penalty for Failure to Issue Notice of Intention/Replacement."

The members reviewed and discussed Sections 08, and 09, and agreed that there were no necessary changes required.

Section 10.8 was discussed next. Ms. Prouty suggested adding a reference to the associated Authorized Costs to this section. Ms. Prouty further suggested inserting the related Authorized Costs to every section in the Handbook. Ms. Hernandez suggested the following proposed additional verbiage for Section 10.8, "Refer to Transfer Costs: Power Circuits 21-49 – Communications Circuits 75-109." SBC will create the language for Section 10.9.

The members discussed creating Section 10.13 to address push braces, however, after the members discussed this issue, they agreed that it was not necessary. Sections 3.1, and 15.3 deal with this issue. The members decided to convene, and to continue with Section 10 at the next meeting.

Mr. Allen questioned if the 1998 Agreement was public record. The members responded that they were not certain if the Agreement was public record. Mr. Allen stated that he thought it a good idea to notify the Committee, that he receives requests for copies of the Agreement.

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 p.m. until March 11, 2004.

---

Jean Baccus, Billing Associate – Level IV

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE**

**437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3**

**San Dimas, CA 91773**

**Phone (909) 592-4001**

**Fax (909) 592-4636**

**April 06, 2004**

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  
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell  
Ms. Paula Haney – Verizon California  
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (DWP)  
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles (DWP)  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS  
Mr. Dan Lewis – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

The only issue on the agenda is **Item 1343: Routine Review.**

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 p.m. until March 11, 2004.

---

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**

**May 04, 2004**

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:

Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Ernie Solorzano – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Paula Haney – Verizon California  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS  
Mr. Doug Schmaderer – City of Pasadena  
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

The primary issue on the agenda is **Item 1343: Routine Review**. Ms. Prescott included the revision of the history of the SCJPC reflected on the Committee web page. She distributed two copies of proposed revisions. The first is referred to as the short version, and a second one referred to as the longer version. The members reviewed the proposed language revisions. The consensus was that version one best presented a description of the SCJPC. The members reviewed version one and made some minor changes (see attached).

The members then moved on to the review of the Routine Handbook. The last sentence, “This section must be used when poles other than wood are placed, or replaced”, was deleted in Section 1.2.

The timeframe of 30 days in Section 3.0 has been changed to 45 days. To address the issue of using other than wood poles, three sections have been added. They are Sections 3.14 Notice of Intent to Place other Than Wood Pole, Section 4.14 Purchase of Interest other than Wood Pole, and Section 7.14 Replacement with other than Wood Pole.

The members continued working on Sections 3.0, 3.3, 3.4 and new Section 3.10. Upon their return they will continue on with Section 3.14.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m. until June, 2004.

---

Jennie Corella – Office Manager

## History of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee

The **Joint Pole Committee** is made up of a group of member representatives of utilities and municipalities in Southern California who hold joint equity interest in utility poles. Established by telephone, electricity and railroad companies, the Committee has existed since October 10, 1906. It was formed as a result of the need to limit the number of poles in the field and to create a uniform procedure for recording ownership of poles. ~~There are currently 27 members in the JPC.~~ Each member has a vote and shares in the expenses of the Committee according to their joint pole interests.

The purpose of the Joint Pole Committee office is to keep accurate records of ~~percentage~~ of ownership for each pole and keep on file a master record of each jointly- owned pole. The principal function is to ~~determine~~ calculate the ~~monetary~~ established value of each transaction, involving the sale or purchase of joint pole equity interests or maintenance of those interests. The Joint Pole Committee office prepares monthly Bills of Sales to the members to enable them to make monetary settlement of their joint pole enterprises.

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

**June 10, 2004**

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. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Paula Haney – Verizon California  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 9:05 am with **Item 1366: Review of Anchor, Overhead/Down Guy**. Ms. Hernandez briefed the members on this issue, which was brought to the table by AT&T Wireless. She stated that she needed some clarification on overhead guys. Her concern is whether, or not, an incoming member is required to purchase interest in the guy when the incoming members attachment has no bearing on the overhead guy. Ms Hernandez further stated that power and communication tend to over-guy, therefore, she is of the opinion that the incoming member need not purchase interest in overhead/down guys. Section 12.2 implies that incoming members must purchase interest in existing guys, and that members may agree on joint use. The members discussed Section 12.2 for clarification, agreed that it implies that incoming members must purchase interest in existing guys. Ms. Prescott suggested that members bring examples pertaining to this situation to the next meeting. Ms. Hernandez proposed adding verbiage addressing the issue of guys that are adequate, or over adequate. The members reviewed Authorized Cost item 110 (a) Overhead, span, or arm guy at a cost of \$291.00. The consensus among the members is that it appears high. Ms. Prescott suggested, for clarification, to add verbiage to Section 12.2 as follows: “If existing overhead guy, down guy, and/or anchor is adequately sized to support a new member attachment, new member may purchase into the existing guy and anchor”. It was agreed to add this verbiage to Section 12.2.

Item 1361: Removal of Ivy was on the agenda. This item is contingent on a fee agreed upon by Authorized Costs. Language for this item will be addressed when a fee is established by Authorized Costs.

The last issue on discussion was **Item 1343: Routine Review**. The members reviewed the changes they had agreed upon to date. The members discussed Section 3.1 extensively, and edited the previous revisions.

In Section 4.0, the words, “or equipment” will be deleted from the first paragraph.

The members discussed and revised Section 4.14, which is a new section being added to the Routine Handbook. The section title is as follows, “Purchase of Interest in Other than Wood Pole”. The other section created to deal with the issue of “other than wood poles”, is section 7.14 which is titled, “Replacement of Wood Pole with other than Wood Pole.”

The members reviewed new Section 7.13 – Failure to Issue Notice of Intention/Replacement. This section mirrors Section 3.3 with regards to replacement, instead of construction. This item was discussed extensively. The issue of penalties was discussed among

the members. Ms. Hernandez stated that her primary concern is not with penalties, but with locating the initiating JPA for the pole replacement, and whether the JPA has been finalized. The verbiage for this section was reviewed, and there were some minor changes.

Sections 5, 8 and 9 have no proposed changes.

Section 10.8 was discussed next. SBC is proposing no changes. SCE proposes to split this section to address separately, transfers and rearrangements, since they are two different functions. SCE is proposing having Section 10.8, and adding 10.9 to address the two functions. The consensus is that this item remains open until SCE has reviewed the section, and provides a proposal.

Ms. Prescott suggested taking the first five sections of the Routine Handbook, and placing them on the Discussion Calendar of the July 2004 Board meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m. until July 2004.

---

Jennie Corella – Office Manager

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

**July 20, 2004**

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. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (DWP)  
Ms. Paula Haney – Verizon California  
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless  
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 9:05 am. Ms. Prescott reported that Sections 1 through 5 would be on the Consent Calendar of the next Board meeting. The members read and reviewed Section 7. A typo was discovered in Section 7.4, the error was noted and would be corrected. The members discussed next Section 7.6, and after discussion and clarification, the consensus is to leave this section as is.

The members discussed Section 7.7, and created new verbiage. The verbiage is as follows:

Any member maintaining an unauthorized attachment in a pole to be replaced shall:

- Purchase interest in existing pole at structural value with a 50% penalty.
- Relinquish interest.
- Receive salvage.
- Pay pulling and transportation.

This member shall also transfer at own expense and purchase interest in replacing pole.

If member with unauthorized attachment proposes to abandon concurrent with replacement, it shall:

- Purchase interest in existing pole at structural value with a 50% penalty.
- Relinquish interest.
- Receive salvage.
- Pay pulling and transportation.

The members then reviewed Sections 7.8, and 7.9. There were no changes to 7.8.

The members discussed Section 7.9 extensively, and agreed that the verbiage in this section could be decreased and reworded.

Under miscellaneous items Ms. Corella reported that the Committee staff has a question in regards to correction of records. The question is whether any member on a JPA may correct a pole record. Ms. Baccus joined the members and explained the scenarios and conflicting information the Committee office is receiving in regards to correcting JPAs, within a billing cycle. The members agreed to discuss this issue at length, and arrive at a resolution at the next Operating Meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m. until August 2004.

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

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

**August 11, 2004**

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:

Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles (DWP)  
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena  
Ms. Paula Haney – Verizon California  
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS  
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 11:05 am. She then reported that Sections 1 through 5 were approved at the July 2004 Board meeting.

At the previous meeting, the members had reviewed, but not completed Section 7. Therefore, the members reviewed their revisions for Section 7. The members reviewed and discussed the revisions to Section 7.7, and agreed that the proposed revisions required additional revisions. The revised proposal is as follows:

*Any member maintaining an unauthorized attachment in a pole to be replaced shall:*

- *Purchase interest in existing pole at structural value with a 50% penalty.*
- *Receive salvage if applicable.*
- *Pay pulling, transportation, and disposal.*
- *Transfer at own expense.*
- *Purchase interest in the replacing pole.*

*This member shall also transfer at own expense and purchase interest in replacing pole.*

*If member with unauthorized attachment proposes to abandon concurrent with replacement, it shall:*

- *Purchase interest in existing pole at structural value with a 50% penalty.*
- *Receive salvage if applicable.*
- *Pay pulling, transportation and disposal.*

There are no changes to Section 7.8. Sections 7.9, and 7.10 have minor revisions. Sections 7.12, 7.13, and 7.14 are proposed new sections to be added to the Routine. The members completed their review of Section 7, and moved on to Section 8.

Section 8 addresses rights of way. The members reviewed this section, and the consensus is to have Sections 8.0, and 8.1 reviewed by the members respective legal departments. Ms. Hernandez suggested inquiring whether this section truly belongs in the Routine Handbook, and perhaps it should be deleted. However, it was agreed that Section 8.2 should remain.

The members then addressed Section 9, Interset Pole. The members discussed the definition of an interset pole. The consensus is to add the following verbiage to Section 9.0: "Refer to Section 3.0 if pole is to be placed for mutual benefit." There were no suggested revisions to Sections 9.1 through 9.5.

The members clarified that when a member exercises Authorized Costs Item 14: Failure to Final JPA Administrative Fee (per JPA)...53.00, a copy of the Form 7 sent to the member in default must be attached to the final JPA received at the JPC office. If the Form 7 (as described in Section 18.1F) is not attached, the action of the JPC staff is to return the Item 14 JPA to the members that finalized the JPA. Ms. Prouty stated that if her organization receives a JPA on a Form 44 with an Item 14 charge, and the notifying Form 7 is missing, the JPA would be rejected.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m. until tentatively September 8, 2004.

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

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

**September 9, 2004**

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:

Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles (DWP)  
Ms. Paula Haney – Verizon California  
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS  
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 10:00 am. The members discussed Section 8 – Rights of Way. The members considered removing this section, or shortening it. The issue is the legalities involved with easements. Ms. Prouty stated that there is a Form 8 that addresses rights of way. After much discussion, the final consensus is to have members consult with easement specialists within their organization, and have them review this section for clarification. Ms. Corella would attempt to locate a copy of a Form 8 for the next ad hoc meeting.

The members then moved on to section 10. In sections 10.1, and 10.2, the words, “preferably the original owner” will be deleted. In section 10.5 it was agreed to drop the words, “for incoming lines”. In section 10.7 it was agreed to change the title to read, “Adding Circuits *or Facilities* in Communication Space”. It is agreed that section 10.8, which reads, “Transfer of Rearrangement of Facilities by One Owner”, would be divided into two sections (10.8 and 10.9). One section would address transfer of facilities, and the other section would address rearrangement of facilities. Edison will create the verbiage for both sections, and bring it to the next ad hoc meeting for review by the members.

The members reviewed and discussed section 11, and agreed that no changes were required.

The members then reviewed section 12. It was agreed to add a paragraph to section 12.2. The paragraph reads as follows: “*If existing overhead guy, down guy, and/or anchor is adequately sized to support a new member attachment, new member shall purchase into existing guy or anchor*”. The members agreed that sections 12.3, 12.4, and 12.5 do not require change. The members then discussed section 12.6 extensively. Ms. Prescott rephrased the section to read as follows, “*The member replacing anchor for sole benefit shall bear all costs to replace anchor and transfer facilities. The owner of existing anchor shall be assigned interest without charge in replacing anchor and shall receive cost of transferring guy wire*”. Mr. Walls stated that in his opinion, the entire first sentence in this current section should be removed. Ms. Thomas suggested the following verbiage, “*If attachment to an existing anchor would require replacement of said anchor, the owner(s) of anchor shall be assigned interest without charge in replacing anchor and shall receive cost of transferring guy wire*”. Ms. Hernandez stated that section 7.5 (pole replacement) refers to a solely owned pole, and that section 12.6 (anchor replacement) should be uniform with section 7. Therefore, her recommendation is to separate

between 1) a solely owned anchor, and 2) a jointly owned anchor. This would be consistent with section 7, and outside plant would have clarification with interpretation. She suggested adding 12.6 (a), which would allow differentiating joint and solely owned anchors. The members discussed this section further and agreed on the following language, “If attachment to an existing anchor would require that anchor to be replaced for the sole benefit of incoming member, the new anchor would be replaced at the expense of the incoming member. The owner(s) of existing anchor shall be assigned interest without charge and shall receive cost of transferring guy wire”. The members agreed to continue reviewing section 12.6 upon their return.

Ms. Corella questioned section 18.1-A Preparation of Form 2 Preliminary JPA . The members agreed that they would discuss this issue in more detail when they review the entire section (18).

Mr. Walls requested a new item number for discussion and proposal of creating a Form 9 for riser notification. **Item 1373: Form 9 – Riser Notification** has been assigned to this ad hoc committee.

These revisions are merely proposals and will not become effective until the entire Routine Handbook has been reviewed, the proposals approved by the Board, and then published on the SCJPC web site.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 p.m. until October 2004.

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

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

**November 10, 2004**

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. Thomas Daly – City of Los Angeles (DWP)  
Mr. Ernie Solorzano – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles  
Ms. Paula Haney – Verizon California  
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS  
Mr. Malcolm Brown – AT&T Wireless  
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 9:25 am. The members reviewed proposed language for **Sections 10.8 and 10.9**. Ms. Haney commented on the last sentence in section **10.8**. The last sentence in this proposed section revision reads as, “*Number of transfers will be designated by Authorized Cost Item 83 and other associated Authorized item numbers per agreement.*” The revised proposed last sentence has been edited to read, “**Number of transfers will be designated by associated power and communications transfer Authorized Costs items.**” The proposed language for section **10.9**, reads as follows, “*Upon approval, a joint owner may rearrange the facilities of another owner and/or their tenants on an existing pole. Refer to Authorized Cost XX.*” The revision to this proposed section has been edited to read as follows, “**Upon approval, a joint owner may rearrange the facilities of another owner and/or their tenants on an existing pole. Number of rearrangements will be determined by associated power and communications transfer Authorized Costs.**”

The next section reviewed by the members was **Section 12.6**. At the previous ad hoc meeting the members had created language for section **12. 6**. The proposed language reads as follows, “**If attachment to an existing anchor would require that anchor to be replaced for the sole benefit of incoming member, the new anchor would be replaced at the expense of the incoming member. The owner(s) of existing anchor shall be assigned interest without charge and shall receive cost of transferring guy wire.**” The members agreed on this language with the following verbiage attached to the last sentence, “**in accordance with Authorized Costs.**”

Next, the attending members reviewed **Section 13**. At a previous meeting the members proposed to revise the section title to read, “**Correction of Record/Cancellation**”. The members proposed adding verbiage to section 13.1, paragraph 1, sentence 1. The revision is inserting the underlined verbiage as follows, “Correction of error in recorded data or any other detail shall be made on Joint Pole Authorization **in accordance with Section 18 Example 8** and.....” Ms. Hernandez will create Example 8, a JPA reflecting a “correction of record” to support the added verbiage to section 13.1, paragraph 1, sentence 1. Currently, JPA Example 3, reflects a correction of record JPA, however, it will be revised to delete the correction of record information. The members agreed to propose **deleting paragraphs 2 and 3** from Section 13.1.

The members briefly discussed Section 13.2, and agreed to start the next ad hoc meeting by addressing this section initially.

These revisions are merely proposals and will not become effective until the entire Routine Handbook has been reviewed, and the Board approves all proposals recommended by the ad hoc. Upon completion of Board approval, all revisions will be published on the SCJPC web site.

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m. No future meeting was scheduled at this time.

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager