

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

**February 9, 2005**

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 9:30 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless  
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. Norine Luker – NextG Networks (via telephone)  
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff  
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 9:35 am. Ms. Prescott reported that the Board has approved Sections 7 through 11; however, Section 7.13 was returned per Edison to the ad hoc for further review. Ms. Goetz reported that she did not have anything to provide to the Committee at this time. Ms. Dell stated that she would like to re-visit Section 7.4 Replacement of Pole in Same Hole. Ms. Dell stated that this section should be used in tandem with another section seven. This would aid new members in clarifying **Section 7.4**. The proposed additional verbiage to this section is as follows: ***This section to be used in conjunction with the appropriate replacement section.*** This sentence would be inserted at the end of the paragraph before the parenthesis.

Ms. Corella stated that the staff have a suggestion for **Section 2.7E**. Ms. Baccas stated that she would like to insert the verbiage, “**or greater**” after the word “grade” in the paragraph. After much discussion, the consensus is to propose adding the additional verbiage to this section.

Ms. Hernandez stated that she would like clarification on **Section 18.1F** because of problems she has been encountering with SCE. Ms. Hernandez distributed copies of Routine Revision meetings dated September and October 2000. The issue of failure to final a JPA was discussed at these meetings. Ms. Hernandez stated that there is miscommunication in the interpretation of this section between SCE and ATW. The misinterpretation is in the second sentence with the words “**and/or**”. Ms. Goetz stated that according to the section, any member may final a JPA by issuing the Form 48 and/or final JPA. Ms. Hernandez stated it is not an option of *and/or*, but a Form 48 must be issued if work is complete and the issuing party has neglected to issue Form 48. Then the JPA may be finalized.

Next, the members discussed Section 12.9 through 12.12. It was agreed that this section requires no revisions.

Ms. Hernandez asked the Chair if she could make a statement in regards to JPAs. Ms. Prescott responded that Ms. Hernandez is welcome to her statement. Ms. Hernandez stated that she would like to remind the members that the date the Form 48 was sent must be noted on the JPA at the bottom line of Location/Nature of Work section on the final JPA. She stated that she is receiving JPAs that lack such notation. She invited all members to review Section 18.1D under “Note 3”, which refers to this notation. The members responded that they ensure JPAs are noted as such. Please refer to that section should you have any questions.

Section 13 was discussed next. Ms. Hernandez opened with Sections 13.1 and 13.2. She distributed a copy of her first draft for Example 8 reflecting an example of a JPA for correction of record. Ms. Hernandez stated that the header must be identical to the original JPA. The last two paragraphs were deleted from Section 13.1. The verbiage, “see example 8, page 18-13” was added to Section 13.1, first paragraph. A paragraph was added to Section 13.1. Section 13.0 has no proposed changes or revisions.

The members moved on to Section 14. It has been proposed to delete the last sentence in Section 14.0, but leave the word “stepping” in the sentence. The words “or facilities” were added to Section 14.1. There were no proposed changes to Section 14.2. The proposal for Section 14.3 is to insert referral to Authorized Costs 15.B. Section 14.4 has no proposed revisions. Ms. Luker had a question in regards to Section 14.5 Pole Top Extension. She inquired on what basis would a pole owner not approve a pole extension. Ms. Dell responded that extensions may be dangerous, and some utilities do not allow them on their poles. Ms. Luker stated that if the extension met all GO 95 regulations, would the joint owner have the right to disapprove the proposal. Ms. Dell responded that if it is an internal policy of a utility to not allow extensions, the member utility could choose not to approve it. Ms. Luker questioned if a joint member does not approve the extension, could said member reference the clause in the section the states, “*obtain approval of all owners on JPA before installation is made*” as a sufficient reason for non-approval. Ms. Dell responded in this type of situation, the initiating member may move for arbitration. In arbitration, Ms. Dell stated, that members not involved are selected to sit on the arbitration board. Ms. Haney remarked that many times municipalities set the standards for pole construction. The members reiterated that a member may not use the above-mentioned clause alone to deny approval.

Lastly, the members reviewed Section 14.6 Temporary Attachment. Ms. Thomas asked for the entire process for this section. Ms. Hernandez responded that this is for attachments less than 12 months. The initiating party creates a JPA and states on the JPA the projected date of removal of the attachment. A Form 7 is sent to the JPC office quoting the date of removal. Six months prior to the removal date a reminder is sent to the initiating parties engineer that there are six months remaining to remove the temporary attachment from the pole. The engineer must respond that the attachment has been removed, additional time is required, or will remove as scheduled. If more than a 12-month attachment is required, the initiating member must purchase interest. The members discussed this section extensively and agreed that an illustration example should be created for Section 18. It was agreed to continue reviewing Section 14.6 at the next ad hoc meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m. No future meeting was scheduled at this time.

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

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

**March 10, 2005**

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. Paula Haney – Verizon California  
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS  
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (via telephone)  
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff  
Ms. Lynnel Perez - Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 9:15 am. Ms. Prescott opened the meeting by addressing pending issues. It was agreed that Section 8 did not require any revisions. **Section 7.13** has been pulled from Board approval by SCE. It was agreed this issue should remain open for further review upon the return of SCE. A first draft of example 8 is to be created for Section 18 by SBC and AT&T Wireless. Ms. Prouty stated that Ms. Hernandez has completed the first draft. Ms. Prouty stated she would have the draft for the members to review by the next meeting. The last pending issue was **Section 13.2**. The question with this section is the three-year period allowed for refunds. Ms. Baccus referred to the minutes from July 1998. The minutes state that the refund period has been revised to 5 years. Since the Routine currently reflects a 3- year refund period, the proposed revision is for a 5-year refund period.

The members reviewed **Section 14.6**. Some members expressed the lack of clarification in this section. It was decided to re-word and rearrangement the sentences. A suggestion was made to bullet point the process steps, and/or create an example 9 for section 18. This section has been revised to read:

*“A joint pole authorization shall be written for all temporary attachments. A temporary attachment is defined as an attachment of less than one year’s duration. Prepare a preliminary Form 2 showing estimated date of attachment (see example 9). Upon approval of joint pole authorization by all joint members and completion of attachment:*

- *Prepare Form 48.*
- *Prepare final Joint Pole Authorization showing actual date of attachment.*
- *Submit final Joint Pole Authorization to JPC office for billing.*
- *An administration fee will be charged based on the cost of one foot of pole space with no common area cost.*
- *A temporary record will be issued.*

*Upon removal of temporary attachment,*

- *Prepare a form 48 with temporary attachment removal date.*
- *Send copy to all joint members and JPC office.*
- *The JPC office will clear the temporary attachment record.*

*For attachments remaining longer than one year see sections 4.0 or 4.1.* For placement of temporary poles, see Section 3.5.

The members discussed and reviewed Sections 14.7, and 14.8. It was agreed that no changes were required for these sections. The members discussed Section 14.9 – Hand Dig. It was agreed that this section has been misused, however, they agreed that the verbiage is not misleading. Therefore, this section is to remain as it is.

The members moved on to review Section 15. Section 15.1-A – Retagging pole was discussed. The word, “a” will be inserted in the first sentence before the word, “duplicate”. Sections 15.1-B, 15.1-C, 15.2, and 15.3 are not to be revised. The members agreed that the utilities are not adhering to Section 15.2-A Marking Communication Cables. Ms. Thomas stated that in her observance, the only members marking their cables are Verizon Wireless and AT&T Wireless, all other cables are questionable. The consensus is to bring this issue to the table at the next Board meeting. Ms. Prescott stated that she would open discussion on the issue of unmarked communication cables at the next Board meeting under known/unknown business. **Item 1382: Marking Communications Cables** has been assigned to this ad hoc committee for further discussion.

The members reviewed Section 15.4. They agreed that some of the methods of denoting a pole location should be revised. The sixth paragraph has been revised by relocating it as the last sentence of paragraph one. In paragraph two, after the second “etc” the following verbiage was added: (*see Section 20.3*), and the first “etc” was deleted. The paragraph was broken into two sentences. The second sentence starts with “Specify”. Dropping the last two words in the paragraph and adding a reference have revised paragraph three. The next paragraph and the examples on page 15-2 were reviewed next. Example 12 has been revised. The last paragraph on page 15-1 was revised. The following sentence has been added, “In instances where rural areas have been developed, pole record is to be updated to reflect new location (refer to section 13.1).

The members returned to review the examples on page 15-2, Section 15.4. Some minor changes were suggested. The next meeting the chair will open the review discussion with Section 15.5.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m. No future meeting was scheduled at this time.

---

Jean Baccus, Billing Level IV

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

**April 7, 2005**

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. Paula Haney – Verizon California  
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS  
Mr. Dan Lewis – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Doug Schmaderer – City of Pasadena  
Ms. Norine Luker – NetG Networks (via teleconference)  
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff  
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 9:05 am. The first section addressed was 15.5. The members reviewed the section. Mr. Lewis stated that prior to accepting this section as is, he would like to inquire within his organization if SCE has implemented the use of any new fumigants not reflected in the Routine. He further stated that he would report his findings to the committee at the next meeting.

Section 15.5-A was reviewed with no recommended revisions. The first sentence in Section 15.5-B has been revised to read, “Date *of reset* shall be given...” The members reviewed and discussed Sections 15.6, and 15.7 and agreed no revisions were required. This section’s review is complete.

Ms. Prescott decided to review prior sections, and discuss pending issues to ensure that the revisions are accurate. Under pending issues Section 7.13 was returned to the ad hoc Routine Revision committee at the last Board meeting, at the request of SCE. Mr. Lewis stated that he is not aware of the issue SCE (Mr. Solorzano) has with this section. He requested that the ad hoc committee table this issue at this time to allow him to inquire of Mr. Solorzano his concerns with this section.

The next pending issue is the creation of Example 8, which corresponds with Section 13.1 Correction of Record. Ms. Lupe Hernandez previously created the example and presented it to the members at the last ad hoc meeting. However, there were some minor revisions to the example. Ms. Prouty stated that she would have a copy of Example 8 for Section 13.1 by the next meeting. At the last meeting, Section 14.6, Temporary Attachment was revised (please refer to the March Routine minutes for the revisions). Ms. Prouty stated that she would work on creating Example 9, which would demonstrate the correct process of submitting a JPA for Section 14.6.

The members then reviewed Section 12.6. It was agreed to change the first paragraph in this section to read, “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 reviewed Sections 13, and 14, and were satisfied with the revisions.

The members reviewed Section 15, and agreed that this section is satisfactory, with the exception of section 15.5, which was discussed earlier.

Ms. Prescott stated that she would prepare Sections 7 through 15 for presentation to the Board for their approval at the next Administrative Board meeting.

The members moved on to Section 16. Section 16.1, first sentence, the word, “normal” will be deleted. All other sections did not require change.

The members discussed Section 17. Ms. Thomas stated that the second paragraph refers to the base owner having the first right to rent space to a tenant. She further stated that this rule no longer applies. If a joint member owns the space where the perspective tenant would like to lease, it is the owner of that space that would handle the lease agreement. Mr. Lewis stated that he would research this issue within his legal department when he returns to his organization. However, the members agreed to decide on the revisions at this time. In the last sentence of the first paragraph, the words, “the base owner” has been deleted, and replaced with, “a member”. The second paragraph has been deleted. The members agreed not to propose any more revisions to this section until Mr. Lewis returns with his findings.

Mr. Lewis gave some information on why Section 18.1-F was created. He stated that it was added to the Routine prompted by Altrio, and their lack of finalizing their JPAs, when, in fact, the members were aware that Altrio had built their plant. The members decided that a Form 7 should be issued alerting the initiating member that if they failed to finalize their JPA, any member party to the JPA would finalize the JPA. Ms. Thomas responded that this section is no longer being utilized for this purpose. Mr. Lewis stated he would like to discuss this issue further, but would prefer that Mr. Solorzano join the discussion. This will be further discussed in a future ad hoc meeting where Mr. Solorzano is in attendance.

Lastly, the members reviewed Section 18. In Section 18.0 – Record Forms, the members agreed to delete J.U. 50 – Notice of intention to construct underground facilities. All other form descriptions would remain. Section 18.1 would not be revised. In Section 18.1-A, the fourth paragraph, last sentence has been corrected for grammatical errors. The members discussed Section 18.1-B (d), which addresses arbitration. The main concern with this sub-section is that it refers to arbitration procedures, however, the members are not aware of such a process. It was agreed to discuss this sub-section further for clarification, at the start of the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m. No future meeting was scheduled at this time.

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

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

**May 4, 2005**

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. Paula Haney – Verizon California  
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS  
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless  
Ms. Norine Luker – NetG Networks (via teleconference)  
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff  
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 9:15 am. The first section addressed was 18.1-B. The members reviewed the section. The issue of arbitration, and forming an arbitration ad hoc committee was discussed. Ms. Haney stated that an arbitration committee could resolve differences among members. Ms. Thomas stated that an arbitration committee could handle minor issues, and if the resolution is unsatisfactory, a member may opt to involve their legal department. Ms. Prouty added that the primary function of the arbitration committee would be to ensure that the members involved had remained within the Routine Handbook. Item 1384 has been assigned to address creating an arbitration committee. Since, the issue of arbitration is mentioned in the By-Laws, it was agreed to assign this item to both the Routine Revision Committee, and the Reorganization ad hoc Committee. The final consensus is not to revise this section.

Section 18.1-C was reviewed next. It was agreed to revise this section with bullet points. Sub-section (a) shall read as such:

(a) *A Form 7 shall be used for the following:*

- *Correct Joint Pole Authorization*
- *Correct or add accounting data*
- *Correct pole number*
- *Delete pole*
- *Correct pole length*
- *Correct year set*
- *Correct pole treatment (except a change from wood to alternative pole type, i.e. CF, LWS)*
- *Circuit correction*
- *Correct grade and space*
- *Correct, add or delete authorized costs*
- *Correct, add or delete Section number*
- *Change pulling routine*

- Delete owner
- Correct pole location and/or community
- Correct, add or delete tenant
- Correct, add or delete anchors, guys, arms or risers

Section 18.1-C (b) was discussed. The members agreed to inquire with Edison their interpretation of how and when they use this section. The consensus is that if Edison has no need of this section, it may be deleted.

Section 18.1-C(c) was discussed and revised. The revision reads: A revised Form 2 shall be used for the following:

- Add owner(s)
- Add poles(s)
- Change from wood to alternative pole type (i.e. CF,LWS)

Same Joint Pole Authorization number should be used with a revision identifier (i.e. JPA12345 Rev1, JPA 12345 ROI, JPA12345 Rev) and new date sent.

Section 18.1-C(d) was changed to read: Form 48 shall be used for the following:

- Change pulling routine
- Change topping of pole(s)

Section 18.1-D was discussed and NOTE 2 was changed to read: Effective January 1, 2006, Authorizations issued prior to January 1, 1995 will be billed under the current billing practices. The remainder of the paragraph has been deleted. This is the only revision in this section.

There were no revisions for Section 18.1-E.

Section 18.1-F Failure to Final JPA was discussed extensively. The following verbiage was added to the section title: upon completion of construction. This section's paragraphs have been revised, and the process is now displayed via bullet points. It will read as follows:

- Form 48 shall be sent to all members involved, if not previously issued
- Form 7 shall be sent to all members involved notifying of the intent to final bill
- If no response after 15 days of Form 7, member may proceed with finalizing the JPA
- The issuing party will pay the full administrative costs to the member submitting the final as defined in Authorized Costs Item 14.

The members will start the next meeting by reviewing Section 18.2.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m. No future meeting was scheduled at this time.

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

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

**May 24, 2005**

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. Paula Haney – Verizon California  
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS  
Mr. Ernie Solorzano – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Dan Lewis – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Monica Gonzalez – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Shelley Shannon – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Michele Gerard – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless  
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena  
Mr. Charles Vranek – Cingular Wireless  
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff  
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 9:05 am, and started discussion on **Section 2.7-E**. Ms. Baccus proposed the revision of adding the verbiage, “greater” to the section. Ms. Baccus stated that a member is guaranteed the same amount of footage when transferred to a new pole, however, it does not state if they are allowed additional footage. She reiterated that the staff is aware that members should not have less footage, but are concerned if members are allowed additional footage on a Section 18.1. The primary concern is a billing directive for the staff. It was agreed that the JPC staff would maintain a record of the times this situation occurs. They are to contact Ms. Sandra Alvarez of SCE when they receive a JPA with this situation. Mr. Solorzano instructed his staff that was in attendance, to research what is creating this problem within their organization. The consensus is to table this item at this time until the next Routine Revision meeting.

The members next discussed **Section 18.1-F**. Mr. Solorzano opened the discussion by stating that it has come to his attention that, SCE has a different interpretation, or are administering this section incorrectly. Ms. Precott stated that the members have revised and re-created the process for this section. Mr. Solorzano reported that SCE has 3,500 foreign JPAs. The majority of the JPAs are SBC and Verizon California initiated. He instructed his staff to separate those JPAs that are pending, and notify the initiating member to either final bill or cancel the JPA, or SCE would final bill the JPA exercising section 18.1-F. His objective is to decrease the backlog of foreign JPAs, which ties up resources due SCE, and other members. He then inquired from the members’ instances where the process SCE is implementing, created any problem. Ms. Prouty stated that she has an instance where the JPA that was finalized by SCE stating that SBC was attached. Ms. Prouty stated that she personally traveled to the site for a

field check, and discovered that SBC was not attached. Mr. Solorzano inquired if the JPA stated that it had been field verified. Ms. Prouty responded that the JPA stated so, and SCE staff notified her verbally. Mr. Solorzano stated that he discovered within his organization that a template that was created to be used with Altrio, was being used for all JPAs with the similar scenario, stating field verified. This section was discussed extensively, and the consensus is to place this item on the Discussion Calendar of the June Administrative Board meeting, with the possibility of removing the suspension on this section.

The members then discussed the proposed revisions to section 18.1-D. There are revisions to the section on Note 2.

Ms. Prescott then read the revisions to section 18.1-F. The title of this section is proposed to read, "Failure to Final JPA upon Completion of Construction. The process to be followed for this section has bullet points to aid readers.

Mr. Solorzano stated that he discovered that his staff was not taking the necessary steps required to research a JPA prior to invoking Section 18.1-F. Ms. Thomas responded that a large percentage of Section 18.1-F JPAs received in her office had either been finalized earlier, or had been cancelled. Ms. Prouty, and Ms. Hernandez stated that they too were experiencing similar problems. The members agreed that this situation was creating additional, unnecessary work among their staff.

The members then worked on revising Section 18.1-D. This section will be revised with bullet points to aid the reader.

In conclusion, the members agreed to open the next meeting with Section 18.2.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m. No future meeting was scheduled at this time.

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

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

**June 27, 2005**

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. Paula Haney – Verizon California  
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS  
Mr. Dan Lewis – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (via phone conference)  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless  
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff  
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 9:05 am, with **Item 1389: Section 18.1-F Suspension**. This item had been on the June discussion calendar; however, was returned to the ad hoc for further discussion. The issue is that SCE continues operating in the same fashion that prompted the suspension of Section 18.1-F. It appears that the process SCE is utilizing is ineffective. Mr. Lewis reported that Mr. Solorzano and Ms. Goetz are meeting with the SCE staff to restructure the process of handling JPAs. He recommended that this item remain open at this time. The consensus is to place this item on the July 20, 2005 Board agenda for further discussion among the Board members.

The members moved on to review Section 18.2. Ms. Thomas questioned, if all parties have approved a JPA, is it necessary to wait the 45 calendar days. After discussion, the members agreed to add the following verbiage to the end of the last paragraph in the section, *“If all parties to the Joint Pole Authorization have approved the preliminary as written, the 45 calendar days may be waived”*. However, the 45 days shall not be waived if a change has occurred on the preliminary. Ms. Haney stated that VZ has made changes on preliminary JPAs, only to have the final submitted without reflecting the changes. Ms. Haney stated that she would like on record that Verizon California will reject this type of final JPA. DWP agreed and supported Ms. Haney stating that DWP will also reject this type of final JPA. This is the only proposed revision to this section.

The members then reviewed Sections 18.3 and 18.4, and agreed that both sections do not require any revisions.

Section 18.5 was discussed next. It was noted that pole inspections are now recorded on the pole records, since the inspections are handled via a JPA. The only member requesting that the pole inspection method formerly used by SCE should continue as so, is Verizon California. Ms. Haney stated that she would research the method Verizon has chosen for inspections upon her return to her organization. In the second paragraph, LWS and CF pole treatments have been added. The members discussed marking the pole cards with a tenant grade. The words, “tenant

data” are revised to read, “tenant grade”. It was agreed to bullet point the second and third paragraphs of this section, reflecting the information required on pole cards. The verbiage, “joint arms” will be added to the second paragraph, following the word, “anchors”. In the third paragraph the word, “desire”, will be changed to read, “request”. In paragraph four, the words, “a similar, and the similar”, will be changed to read, “the same, and that”, respectively.

The members then discussed Section 18.6. The members attempted to clarify the first sentence in paragraph one. It was agreed to have the sentence reviewed by their respective legal departments. The remainder of the paragraph will have bullet points.

In reviewing Section 18.7, the members discovered a typo in the word “Routine”. The remainder of the section does not require revisions. Section 18.8 was discussed, and the consensus is that this section does not require revisions. Section 18.9 Form J.U. 50 – the consensus among the members is to delete this section.

The members then reviewed the examples in Section 18. The members started with example 1, page 18.6. Number (4) was edited by adding the verbiage, “the date” in the second sentence. In number (10) the word, “should” will be replaced with the word, “may”. Next, the members reviewed example 2. In number (9) the words, “arm or” has been added before the word, “anchor”. Adding the word “arm” has changed the legend on this page.

Mr. Allen suggested creating a section to address abbreviations. The members discussed this briefly, and the consensus is to designate section 20.4 to address abbreviations, and title it “Glossary of Abbreviations”.

The last item discussed was the proposed Riser Notification Form 9, submitted by City of Los Angeles. The members suggested using this form on a trial basis. However, the consensus is to review and discuss the form at the next meeting. The next meeting will open by reviewing example 4 in section 18.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m. No future meeting was scheduled at this time.

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

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

**July 28, 2005**

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. Paula Haney – Verizon California  
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS  
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (via phone conference)  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless  
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff  
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 9:05 am, with **Item 1373: Form 9 Riser**. This item was brought to the table by DWP. The members then discussed how and when the proposed Form 9 should be utilized. It was agreed that the current proposed Form 9 requires revisions. One revision agreed by the members was to make the header on this form uniform with the header on all other JPC forms. Ms. Prescott stated that she would work on revising, and editing the proposed first draft to be consistent with the required information needed when adding risers. It was agreed to title the form, “Riser Notification Form 9”.

In regards to JPC forms, Ms. Haney stated that the website does not allow members to download forms. Ms. Corella stated that when members request forms, the JPC office furnishes the forms via an email attachment. The members discussed having Hyperlink enhance the website with the ability to download forms. It was agreed to discuss the possibility of downloading forms from the JPC website at the next Administrative Board meeting under Known items on the agenda. The discussion of costs for enhancing the website should be discussed at the next Operating Committee meeting.

Next, the ad hoc committee discussed Form 7. The members reviewed the Form 7 example 4 on page 18-9. It was agreed to remove the riser diagram from the Form 7 example. The reference to Section 3.4 in the first paragraph will be deleted. The second paragraph was changed to read, “The example shows the Form 7 being used for change of location.” The paragraphs numbered 1,2, and 3 is deleted. Section 18.1-C in the last bullet, the words, “or risers” was removed. “Refer to Section 18.4”, was added to the first bullet in parenthesis. On the table of Section 18.0 – Record Forms, the Form 9 will be inserted.

Example 5 was reviewed next by the members. It was agreed to place the riser diagram on this example and use it as Example 10 to coincide with Form 9.

Example 8 was created by Ms.Hernandez to address the correct method of completing a JPA for a correction of record. The members reviewed the proposed example 8, and made revisions and additions. Number (3) was edited to read, “Correction of record JPA number must

be the same number as original with a correction of records indicator added. Correction of record indicator must be, "COR". Number (4) was edited to read, "Use Section 13.1 and/or 13.2; show original JPA number & Bill of Sale date of JPA to be corrected. Number (7) was added, and it reads, "If correcting member is other than original initiator, attach Form 49 to final sent to SCJPC with contact information".

Ms. Prouty and Ms. Hernandez, to address temporary attachments, created example 9. The ad hoc members reviewed the proposed example 9 draft. After discussion, it was agreed that the proposed example does not require any revisions.

At the previous meeting, the members had questioned the verbiage in Section 18.6. The first sentence in this section alludes to mortgages and deeds of trust. The members questioned as to why the above-mentioned words were necessary in this section. The members were to inquire within their respective legal departments for direction and/or clarification. Ms. Prouty stated that she inquired within her legal department and their response was they did not understand why the verbiage was in the section. She further reported that her legal has made some suggestions for revising the section, however, the suggestion is a minor change. Mr. Allen stated the in his opinion this section and verbiage alludes to the transfer of titles and deeds of entire circuits. After Mr. Allen's statement, the members agreed that this section should remain intact.

At the previous meeting, the members had discussed Section 2.7-E, and the proposal to add the words, "or greater" to this section. However, SCE had questioned the number of occurrences per month this was an issue. The JPC staff has been instructed to record this type of occurrence. Ms. Corella will present the copies of JPAs with this scenario for the next ad hoc meeting. The objective is to clarify this revision and get this section on the Board agenda for approval.

The last issue discussed was Section 14.4. This section was on the agenda for approval when at the request of SCE it was returned to the ad hoc for further review and discussion. Ms. Thomas stated that she believes that SCE would like to share the cost of stepping poles. Ms. Thomas stated that if a joint member places a riser, which now requires stepping the pole, the expense should be on the joint member placing the riser. The members discussed this issue extensively, and the consensus is to discuss this issue further when an SCE representative is present.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m. No future meeting was scheduled at this time.

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

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

**October 18, 2005**

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. Paula Haney – Verizon California  
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless  
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff  
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 9:10 a.m., and started the meeting with Section 18.1F. This section continues to remain suspended. It is currently on the October Board Discussion calendar.

Section 7.13 was discussed next. This is a newly created section, which reads as follows: **“Section 7.13 – Failure to Issue Notice of Intention of Replacement – If any member replaces pole(s) without issuing a Notice of Intention to the joint owners on record, that member shall be subject o penalty. All associated costs for such replacement in accordance with Section 7.11shall be at the sole expense of the Member in offense.”** When questioned what type of penalty the members had discussed, Ms. Thomas responded that to her recollection, she believes it was a 50% penalty. This section was on the January 2005 Board agenda for Board approval; however, it was pulled back by SCE. Ms. Prescott stated that it has been nearly one year since this section was disputed by SCE. In that time, SCE has not addressed the reason behind returning this section back to the ad hoc. Therefore, Ms. Prescott stated that this new section verbiage would be on the November Consent Calendar for Board approval. She further stated that SCE would have the option to remove this item from Consent to Discussion should they feel it necessary.

Next, Section 17 was discussed. There are some revisions in this section, and that is to change the verbiage, base owner, to read, a member. This section will also be on the November Consent Calendar.

Section 2.7-E is another section returned to the ad hoc at the request of SCE. The revision is adding the verbiage, “or greater” to this section. The issue is that the Routine states that members are guaranteed the same amount of footage on the new pole (not any less), however, it does not state whether a member may purchase additional space on the new pole. Therefore, this is a billing directive. The JPC staff would like direction in allowing members to purchase additional footage. SCE inquired as to how often does this incident occur. The JPC office has tracked this occurrence. SCE was not in attendance at this meeting, therefore, it is the consensus of the attendees that this section be on the November Consent calendar as well.

The next section discussed was Section 14. **Section 14.4** was pulled from Consent by SCE. However, it was agreed that this section would be placed on the November Consent calendar for approval. Ms. Prescott reported that the City of Pasadena would like to add **Section**

**14.10** to address tree removal. Since Mr. Cox was not in attendance, it was agreed that this section could be added at a future date.

Section 18 was again reviewed to ensure that the members have agreed on all revisions/additions and corrections. The members extensively discussed section 18.1-C.

**Item 1373: Form 9 Riser** was discussed next. Ms. Prescott distributed a revised copy of the original form created by DWP. The members modified the form, and agreed to place this item on the November Board consent calendar.

The members reviewed the new and revised examples for Section 18. These will also be on the November Consent Calendar.

The members reviewed **Section 19**. In Section 19.0 the “or 5.3.” is removed. The members agreed to delete section 19.1, and this section shall remain unused. Section 19.2 was revised by deleting the verbiage, “set under agreements made after January 1, 1972”. In the body of this section the following verbiage was removed, “after January 1, 1972”, and in the second paragraph the verbiage, “set under joint pole agreements made after January 1, 1972, and the third paragraph the same verbiage as in paragraph two has been removed. In Section 19.3, the first sentence has been deleted. The members discussed section 19.4, pole access obstructions extensively. The following verbiage has been added at the end of the section, “*Description of pole obstruction shall be noted on Joint Pole Authorization with the estimated cost of removal*”. In the parenthesis the following has been added, “*Also Section 2.7H*”. Section 19.5 was reviewed, and the consensus is that this section does not need revisions. Section 19.6 was revised. The fourth paragraph was revised by moving the first sentence as the last sentence. The word *construction* has been replaced by *facilities*.

**Section 19.7** was reviewed next. The paragraphs were rearranged, and verbiage was added. In the first paragraph the last sentence has been deleted, the word, “trussing” has been added, and authorized costs 6, 17 or 18 are now quoted. The second paragraph is now the sixth paragraph, and the third paragraph is the last paragraph. The fourth paragraph is now the second one, and the word, “setting” has been replaced with “reinforcing”. The fifth paragraph is now the third, and the word, “installation”, has been replaced with the word, “reinforcing”. The last paragraph is now the fourth paragraph. The purpose of rearranging the paragraphs is for clarification.

The first sentence in Section 19.10 has been changed by deleting the word, “when”, and changing the words, “to be”, with, “as”. The last sentence has been deleted.

The members reviewed Section 20, and added Section 20.4, titled, “Joint Pole Authorization Abbreviations”. The members listed abbreviations, and decided that they could add items as they come to mind.

The consensus is to place these items on the November Consent Calendar.

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m. No future meeting was scheduled at this time.

---

Jennie Corella, Office Manager