

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

February 8, 2006

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 1:00 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Paula Haney – Verizon California
Ms. Velma Prouty – AT&T California
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 1:15 p.m. The first issue on the agenda is **Item 1361: Removal of Ivy.** This issue was originally brought to the table by SCE. They are proposing implementation of an authorized cost of \$200.00 for the removal of ivy. Ms. Prouty stated that previously, there has been discussion on this item. She further stated that, as she mentioned at prior ad hoc meetings, AT&T California would only consider this proposal if she is guaranteed a photograph, prior to removal of ivy, of the pole in question, is attached to the JPA. The members agreed that this issue requires in depth discussion. Mr. Chow responded that since he is not completely familiar with this issue at this time, he would like to table this item, and upon returning next month would have the information to discuss this issue further.

The next issue on the agenda is, **Item 1366: Review of Anchor, Overhead/Down Guy.** This issue pertains to allowing the depreciation of anchors. Ms. Hernandez stated that she brought this issue to the table, and is of the opinion that anchors should depreciate. As discussed at prior ad hoc meetings, it appears to members that when an incoming member purchases interest in a pole with an anchor attached, the cost of the anchor is greater than the cost of the pole. They further questioned if this action is fair and equitable. Mr. Allen responded that in his opinion, anchors should not depreciate, in that steel does not deteriorate. The members discussed this, and agreed that this item requires further discussion and should remain open.

The third item on the agenda is **Item 1388: Claims Contact.** This issue addresses requiring the name and phone number of the party responsible for processing damage claims. Ms. Corella reported that she has received information from Verizon Wireless, Verizon California, and AT&T California. The consensus is to contact the members, and solicit the claims contact information once again. The item shall remain open at this time.

The fourth issue on the agenda is **Item 1401: Timeline for Retro Inspections.** Mr. Allen remarked that he brought this issue to the table. This issue questions if there is a time frame for members to submit inspection JPAS, and/or how many years back may a member(s)

bill other joint member(s) for inspections. Mr. Allen stated that in terms of his organization, poles are continually inspected, however, the clerical resources allowed for processing of inspections varies from time to time. Therefore, there are periods when inspection JPAs tend to backlog. Therefore, Mr. Allen would like to clarify if there, or should there be a time line for submitting of inspection JPAs. Ms. Thomas added that at a previous ad hoc meeting, a time limit of three years was suggested. Ms. Prouty suggested a five-year timeline, since this would allow members this length of time to collect if there is an error on the inspection JPA. The consensus is that a five-year timeline is too long. The members agreed to add verbiage addressing the timeline on inspection JPAs to Section 2.7-H. The verbiage is as follows, *“All inspection/inspection and treatment joint pole authorizations will be final billed within three years of inspection date.”* It was agreed that this item would be on the discussion calendar of the March administrative board agenda.

Mr. Allen stated that it has come to his attention, that SCE is sending their inspection JPAs in preliminary status to the JPC office staff, to have the staff verify the poles. Ms. Corella responded that this is true. However, the purpose of this exercise is that it is time effective. The staff receives inspection sheets, which list the poles that have been inspected by SCE. They then pull the pole cards from the database to verify that the pole is joint with SCE and is the correct member as stated on the inspection sheet. While the staff has pulled the pole card, it is at this time that the pole card is updated with the bill of sale month and year, or crossed out on the inspection sheet if the information is incorrect. When the verification, and updating process is complete, the sheets are returned to SCE. SCE then has a turn around time to return the sheets on a JPA with the dollars to appear on the bill of sales for that current month. Since the pole cards must be pulled from the database for updating, it is time effective to handle SCE inspection JPAs in this manner. The members are of the opinion that, it is the responsibility of respective members’ staff to perform this verification exercise, and it is not a function of the JPC staff. The members questioned pole tagging, and if poles are retagged when they are inspected. Ms. Pranata responded that pole tagging is not noted on the pole records. Mr. Chow stated that inspected poles are not necessarily tagged at the time of inspections. Ms. Thomas stated that she receives inspection JPAs that state inspection and retagging charges. In the period of one year she receives a JPA for retagging. She cannot verify if that pole was tagged at the time of inspection, and is now receiving a duplicate billing. No consensus was reached on this issue.

Item 1407: Proposed Revision to Section 4.1, was discussed next. SCE is proposing additional verbiage for this section (see attachment). Mr. Chow stated that in today’s environment, it appears that the purchase of interest into a pole, and the 50% penalty is not an effective deterrent to discourage unauthorized attachments. Therefore, SCE is proposing the additional language and a \$500.00 penalty. Ms. Haney stated that in Verizon’s experience with Section 4.1, there have been many instances that after field verification, it is discovered that this is an erroneous charge, and it is not Verizons plant. SCE corrects the error; however, Verizon is not reimbursed the expense of the field verification due to SCE error. She further stated that if members chose to treat one another punitively, then, Verizon should charge SCE for the additional expense incurred by Verizon, due to SCE error. Mr. Chow responded that the penalty is in line with the CPUC Pulsiver decision of the \$500.00 unauthorized attachment penalty. Ms. Hernandez responded, that years earlier, Ms. Solorzano attempted to implement the \$500.00 penalty into the Routine. However, the consensus among the members, at that time, was that the penalty should not be imposed among members. Ms. Corella stated that in her recollection, Mr. Solorzano was of the opinion that the CPUC would misconstrue this as handling members differently than non-members. The CPUC would interpret this as the JPC acting as a good old boys club. Ms. Hernandez questioned if SCE is discovering many Section 4.1’s. Mr. Chow replied that SCE encounters many unauthorized attachments that are member’s plant. He further

stated that he would not name the violating members. Ms. Haney stated that in representing Verizon, she would propose a penalty to those members that erroneously final JPAs causing Verizon to incur expenses by the need of field verification. Mr. Chow responded that Section 4.1 currently has an illegal attachment penalty. However, SCE is merely attempting to place a greater penalty that would create a greater financial impact on the violators, thus, discouraging illegal attachments. The consensus is that each individual member would track the occurrences of Section 4.1 JPAs received by each member.

The next topic of discussion is **Item 1408: Proposed Revision to Section 7.13.** The members briefly discussed the proposed additional verbiage (see attachment). It was agreed that the proposed revisions require additional work. This item would be tabled at this time.

Mr. Allen raised the issue of pole loading. Mr. Allen stated that he would like some discussion and clarification on the issue. This issue will be discussed further at the next Routine Revision meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m. No future meeting was scheduled at this time.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

Attachments

4.1 Unauthorized Attachment

Each case requiring joint ownership in a pole shall constitute an unauthorized attachment if the Member making such attachment **begins construction and** fails to initiate Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization. Said Member shall be required to purchase interest at **the current year (regardless of the year set of the pole)** structural value and pay an added **\$500 per pole penalty** as per date Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization is issued.

7.13 - PROPOSED NEW SECTION -**Proposed revision**

Failure to Issue Notice of Intention of Replacement

If any Member replaces pole(s) or anchor(s) without issuing a Notice of Intention to the joint owners on record, that member may be subject to penalty. **The penalty will only apply to the PTD of the old pole left in the field. The penalty does not apply for situations that have been agreed to, such as; Emergency / Priority replacement poles, claims / plant damage (car hit pole / etc), or storm condition poles (wind, rain, fire, etc). The affected party(ies) are required to purchase interest into the new pole(s) or anchor(s). This section applies to a 3 year period from the date of installation, otherwise section 7.11 applies.**

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

March 16, 2006

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 1:00 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Paula Haney – Verizon California
Ms. Velma Prouty – AT&T California
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Thomas Dailey – City of Los Angeles
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 1:05 p.m. The first issue on the agenda is the review of the handbook glossary and index. Ms. Prescott stated the purpose of the review, is to verify if any changes to the handbook sections, would have an impact on the glossary and/or index. The members briefly reviewed the glossary to ensure the descriptions were correct. Ms. Hernandez, and Ms. Prouty volunteered to review both the glossary, and index sections. Upon completion of their review, they would email their proposed revisions/additions to the ad hoc committee for their review, and comments.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1361: Removal of Ivy.** This item will be discussed further at the next meeting.

The third issue on the agenda is, **Item 1366: Review of Anchor, Overhead/Down Guy.** Ms. Prescott reported that this item would remain open for further information.

The fourth item on the agenda is **Item 1388: Claims Contact.** Ms. Corella reported that she has been receiving responses from members with their respective claims information. The objective is to create a page on the SCJPC website, that would allow members to obtain the claims contact name and phone number when needed.

Item 1401: Timeline for Retro Inspections followed next on the agenda. The members stated that additional verbiage has been created to identify the time frame. The verbiage addressing the timeline on inspection JPAs, to be added to Section 2.7-H, is as follows, **“All inspection/inspection and treatment joint pole authorizations will be final billed within three years of inspection date.”** It was agreed that this item would be on the Consent calendar of the April administrative board agenda.

Item 1407: Proposed Revision to Section 4.1, was discussed next. SCE has created additional verbiage to add to this section (see attachment). From the previous ad hoc meeting, SCE was to track the number of occurrences, where members were attached unauthorized. Mr. Solorzano reiterated that, many instances it is obvious that the member is not intentionally unauthorized, and that information has been omitted from the JPA. The intent is for those

members that are intentionally unauthorized, and are operating their business as usual, but do not initiate the JPA to get the pole(s) on record. Mr. Solorzano stated that SCE is working on a desktop procedure to work in tandem with this revised section. Ms. Haney proposed tabling this item until the SCE desktop procedure is complete, and the members have the opportunity to review it. Mr. Solorzano reported that the procedure would be complete by the following Tuesday. He would then forward the procedure to the members. This would give the members an opportunity to review the procedure, and if they were in agreement prior to ten days before the meeting, Mr. Solorzano would propose to place the revised section on the following discussion Board agenda. Ms. Prouty clarified that even with Board approval this item would not become effective until January 2007. It was agreed to table this item at this time.

The next topic of discussion is **Item 1408: Proposed Revision to Section 7.13.** SCE has created a revision to this section by adding additional verbiage (see attachment). Ms. Haney stated some of the verbiage addressed in the revisions is already addressed in other sections. Therefore, the additional verbiage is redundant. Ms. Hernandez added that this section was not created to be punitive. Mr. Solorzano stated that if this section were not clarified, then, future members would find it difficult to ascertain what was the intent of this section originally. The members discussed the original intent of this section, and the several situations they have incurred in regards to this issue. The consensus is that the punitive portion of this section is that the replacing members shall not be compensated by the other joint members for the work incurred by the offending member. This item would be tabled at this time. Mr. Solorzano stated that the purpose of the additional verbiage is to identify the penalty. However, it is now clear how the offending member is penalized. After extensive discussion on this section, and the proposed additional verbiage, the consensus is to re-write the proposed revisions. Ms. Hernandez stated that she would work on the revision.

Under miscellaneous items is **JPA's finalized as Section 18.1-D.** The members agreed that the primary problem with the routine sections is the interpretation, and the original intent. Since revisions are updated, and effective the first of every year, the consensus is to publish on the SCJPC website, the intent and interpretation of the section in question. This would require adding a new interpretation section to the website. Mr. Chow added that on the web, it would state the section verbatim, and the ad hoc's agreed upon interpretation. It is agreed to table this item at this time.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m. No future meeting was scheduled at this time.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

Attachments

4.1 Unauthorized Attachment

Each case requiring joint ownership in a pole shall constitute an unauthorized attachment if the Member making such attachment **begins construction and** fails to initiate Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization. Said Member shall be required to purchase interest at **the current year (regardless of the year set of the pole)** structural value and pay an added **\$500 per pole penalty** as per date Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization is issued.

7.13 - PROPOSED NEW SECTION -**Proposed revision**

Failure to Issue Notice of Intention of Replacement

If any Member replaces pole(s) or anchor(s) without issuing a Notice of Intention to the joint owners on record, that member may be subject to penalty. **The penalty will only apply to the PTD of the old pole left in the field. The penalty does not apply for situations that have been agreed to, such as; Emergency / Priority replacement poles, claims / plant damage (car hit pole / etc), or storm condition poles (wind, rain, fire, etc). The affected party(ies) are required to purchase interest into the new pole(s) or anchor(s). This section applies to a 3 year period from the date of installation, otherwise section 7.11 applies.**

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

May 2, 2006

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 – AT&T California
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 9:05 a.m. The first topic on the agenda is Item 1361: Removal of Ivy. This item is also on the Authorized Costs Elements ad hoc committee agenda for a proposal of \$200.00 brought to the table by SCE.

The **index**, with the minor revisions, is ready to upload onto the SCJPC website.

Ms. Hernandez further reported that there were minor revisions required for Section 3.1. Section 3.0 expresses the term, “intention to construct”. The other sections use the term, “intention”, without the verbiage, “to construct”. It was agreed for the sake of consistency, to add the verbiage, “to construct” to the remaining sections under Joint Planning Practice. A typo was identified in section 3.10, which would be corrected immediately. The consensus is to make these revisions effective January 2007. Section 3 will be proposed revision number 1.

The members moved forward in reviewing the glossary. Ms. Hernandez shared a list of glossary pole definitions. She believed it had been sent to her from the SCJPC office. However, after the members reviewed the list, they agreed that it is likely the pole definitions are from a member power utility, and agreed that the pole definitions should be included in the Routine Handbook glossary. The members discussed the list of pole definitions. Some definitions were revised, while others were completely deleted. The section in the glossary for pole definitions is now section H. Ms. Hernandez stated that in Section E – Equipment she has noted the words, “transformers – antennas?”. Ms. Prescott stated that the ad hoc might have discussed adding the mentioned equipment, and definition, to this section of the glossary. **Item 1412: Glossary Section E – Additional Equipment** has been assigned to this ad hoc to address adding antennas and transformers.

The second item on the agenda is **Item 1361: Removal of Ivy**. This issue is contingent on an agreed upon cost provided by the authorized costs ad hoc committee. This item would remain open at this time.

Third on the agenda is **Item 1366: Review of Anchor, Overhead/Down Guy**. Ms. Hernandez stated that this issue is also contingent on the authorized ad hoc committee.

Item 1388: Claims Contact was next for discussion. Ms. Corella reported that she has received some responses. She added that she would continue contacting those members individually, via email, that have not responded, until the list is complete. Mr. Chow inquired if the emergency number page on the SCJPC web site is password protected, and if the claims page would be password protected. The member's response is that with the exception of the calendar, and officer page, all pages on the left hand menu are password protected.

Item 1401: Timeline for Retro Inspections followed next on the agenda. This item is on the consent calendar of the April administrative board meeting agenda. Ms. Prouty stated that the committee must stress that newly approved maintenance program members may bill only poles inspected after their date of board approval. Ms. Haney added that her organization has been receiving Edison inspection invoices that are several years old, which is disconcerting to her supervisor. Her supervisor then made an agreement with SCE that inspection invoices would be no older than one year. Mr. Chow responded that this might have occurred at the start of the agreement, because SCE had a large backlog. Ms. Haney added her organization might continue to receive older inspection invoices. Mr. Chow added that the inspection process is lengthy, and the turn-around time is greater than one year. The members discussed the clarification that members who have their maintenance program approved, may not bill for poles inspected prior to the date of approval. The consensus is to discuss clarification verbiage at the next board meeting.

Item 1407: Proposed Revision to Section 4.1, was discussed next. At the previous meeting, SCE committed to sending the members a desktop procedure for unauthorized attachment. Mr. Chow reported that the group at SCE handling this issue has not completed the documented process. This item is to remain open at this time.

The next topic of discussion is **Item 1408: Proposed Revision to Section 7.13**. SCE has created a revision to this section by adding additional verbiage. At the previous ad hoc meeting, Ms. Hernandez volunteered to re-work the proposed verbiage. Ms. Hernandez apologized to the group, in that she failed to complete the task, however, guaranteed the members that, it would be completed by the next ad hoc meeting. Ms. Haney stated that she was not satisfied with the verbiage proposed by SCE, additional verbiage is required to ensure that members notify one another. She stated an example of section 7.6, that a JPA should be initiated in a timely manner so the responding party might act quickly on it. She is of the opinion that verbiage to address this issue should be added. The members agreed with Ms. Haney in this situation. Ms. Thomas added that initial notification is important, and she rarely receives such notification. The consensus is that time frames/limits should be set for replacements in section seven. **Item 1413: Review of Section 7-Timeframes** has been assigned to this ad hoc to address the issue of JPA time limits.

The last issue for discussion is **Item 1410: Section Interpretation on Web**. This pertains to interpretation of automatic approval. Ms. Hernandez has created verbiage to serve as interpretation of the automatic approval process. Ms. Corella stated that at the previous ad hoc meeting, the members discussed placing interpretations on the web for problematic sections. Rather than revise and/or create sections, perhaps an interpretation and/or the intent of the section in question could be placed on the web. Automatic approval is the first section requiring interpretation. Mr. Chow stated that after reviewing the interpretation provided by Ms. Hernandez, the effect is 90 days, however, technically according to the Routine a JPA is automatically approved after 45 days. Ms. Hernandez responded that in section 3.0, the 45 days pertains to construction, in that if the initiating member has not received a response, may start

construction on the 46th day. Mr. Chow responded that section 18 states that a JPA is considered approved after 45 days. Ms. Prouty added that it may state that, but that is not the intent. She further stated that when a JPA has been finalized via 18.1, it should match the preliminary, however, in many instances it has changed from the original preliminary. Ms. Prouty added that SCE is failing to field verify, and therefore their quality control is not what it should be. Mr. Chow responded that SCE does field verify, and that is when changes are made on the preliminary. Ms. Prouty responded that she is not speaking of the changes to the preliminary, but those changes made on the finalized JPAs. Mr. Chow agreed that if there are changes, a Form 7 should be sent to the members on the JPA. Ms. Haney suggested noting the name and phone number of the person who handles the field verification. Mr. Chow responded that the person(s), who handle field verification, do not know the Routine Handbook, and how it applies, but merely handle quality control to check what was done in the field. The members discussed numerous situations they have experienced with this section. Ms. Prescott interjected that it appears that this issue would require additional work. Therefore, she is proposing to table this until the next ad hoc meeting.

Under miscellaneous items is **JPAs finalized as Section 18.1-D**, which was covered under item 1410.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 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 2, 2006

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 – AT&T California
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 9:05 a.m. The first topic on the agenda is **Item 1361: Removal of Ivy**. This item is also on the Authorized Costs Elements ad hoc committee agenda for a proposal of \$200.00 brought to the table by SCE. The members agreed that the \$200.00 proposal is not acceptable by this ad hoc. This proposed cost requires additional discussion. The consensus is to remove this item from the Routine agenda. When, and if, a cost is approved, then a new item number would be assigned to create the section/language relating to the approved authorized cost. This item will remain open on the authorized cost committee agenda. However, this item has been closed in the routine revision ad hoc committee.

The second item on the agenda is **Item 1366: Review of Anchor, Overhead/Down Guy**. Since this issue is also contingent on the authorized costs ad hoc committee, it was agreed to remove this item from the routine revision agenda. If necessary, in the future a new item number would be assigned to this issue.

Item 1388: Claims Contact was next for discussion. Ms. Corella reported that she has sent out several notices to members requesting their claims contact information. She has received several responses. The consensus is to send out a final notice requesting the information, and inform members that if a claims contact name is not submitted by the end of May, then the member representative would be listed as the claims contact. The item is to remain open at this time.

Item 1407: Proposed Revision to Section 4.1, was discussed next. At a prior meeting, SCE committed to sending the members a desktop procedure for unauthorized attachment. Ms. Corella reported that at the previous meeting, Mr. Chow reported that SCE had not completed the documentation of the process. Since, SCE is not in attendance, the consensus is to table this item at this time.

The next topic of discussion is **Item 1408: Proposed Revision to Section 7.13**. SCE requested that this section be revised. Cingular Wireless has created a revised version of this section. The members reviewed the proposed revision, and agreed to place this item on the discussion calendar of the May 2006 board agenda.

The next issue for discussion is **Item 1410: Section Interpretation on Web**. This item addresses clarification of specific sections that would be posted on the SCJPC web page. Any revisions approved during the course of the current year would automatically become part of the Routine Handbook in January of the following year.

Ms. Hernandez has created clarification for section 18.1-D. The members reviewed the clarification to ensure that the content was correct. Ms. Hernandez stated that her intent is to identify what constitutes written and/or verbal communication. The members discussed the clarification, and made minor changes to the clarification. It was agreed that this item would be on the discussion calendar of the next Administrative board meeting.

The committee next discussed **Item 1411: Create Section 18.9 Form 9 Riser**. The members reviewed the created verbiage, and agreed to include this item on the discussion calendar of the next Administrative board meeting.

Next discussed is **Item 1412: Glossary Section E – Additional Equipment**. The members are of the opinion that transformers, and antennas should be included in this section. An email would be sent to all members requesting equipment, and their definitions they would like to include in the glossary under equipment.

Item 1413: Review of Section 7 – Time Frames. The members reviewed the revision to section 7.6. Additional verbiage has been added to this section, second paragraph. This item is also included in the next discussion calendar of the next Administrative board meeting.

The final issue for discussion is **Item 1416: Outline/Maintenance Program Board Approval**. Ms. Hernandez documented the process in getting a member's maintenance program board approved in order to have their inspection costs shared with joint members. The outline would not be in the routine handbook, but would be available to members via the SCJPC web site. The members reviewed documents submitted by those members with approved programs. Upon a satisfactory completion of the inspection/maintenance outline, the members agreed to place this item number on the discussion calendar of the next board meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m. The next meeting would be scheduled at the next board meeting.

.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

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

June 20, 2006

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 – AT&T California
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Mr. Bradley Sanders - City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 9:05 a.m. The first topic on the agenda is **Item 1388: Claims Contact**. The claims contact information is now available to members via the SCJPC web page. The consensus is to close this item at this time. The members discussed the issue of contacting the members, via email, quarterly to remind them to review the membership information to ensure the information is correct. If a correction is required, they must contact the manager of any changes.

Item 1407: Proposed Revision to Section 4.1, was discussed next. At a prior meeting, SCE stated that they would submit their desktop procedure to the ad hoc for review and discussion. Mr. Chow reported that the department handling, and creating the process has not completed the project. He added that Mr. Solorzano has reviewed several drafts, and returned them to the parties responsible for further re-work. He stated that when a satisfactory draft is submitted, and approved by Mr. Solorzano, SCE would submit a copy to the ad hoc for review. This item is to remain open at this time.

The last issue on the agenda is **Item 1412: Glossary Section E – Additional Equipment**. Ms. Prescott inquired if any members would like any other equipment added to the glossary. Ms. Prouty responded that she compiled a list of equipment for consideration. After some discussion, the members agreed that all equipment could not be listed, and that member personnel should be familiar with equipment, and it's definition. The final consensus is to remove Section E – Equipment from the glossary. Section H will be created, and entitled, "Guys", and parts (a), and (b) from Equipment will be copied to this new section. The changes will be posted on the web.

Under miscellaneous items, Cingular Wireless raised the concern of **Section 7.3 (overbuild) versus 3rd party billing**. Ms. Hernandez opened the discussion. She stated that the wireless member utilities are being billed as a third party, and not as members of the SCJPC. Her organization has received billing from SCE, and when she questioned SCE why her organization is referred to as a 3rd party, they responded that the term "3rd party billing" is merely

semantics. She added that all charges should be reflected on the JPA, and not on a separate invoice as non-members are billed. She stressed that this issue requires clarification, since some members have a misinterpretation of the term “3rd party”. Mr. Chow interjected stating that, wireless carriers requests are handled by the SCE IMS department. He added that the JPA is received at SCE as Section 7.3; however, the IMS department prefers to handle the JPA as Section 1.2. Their opinion is that the costs in the Routine are inadequate, and do not compensate SCE equitably for the work performed, and related costs. Primarily, the transfer costs in the Routine are insufficient. Therefore, the JPA would refer to Section 7.3, and Section 1.2. He added that the SCE work order costs include the CIAC charge, and ITC tax. In regards to the aforementioned charges, Ms. Hernandez stated that noted in the tariff charges, members do not charge one another for taxes. Ms. Prouty, and Ms. Thomas agreed with Ms. Hernandez, and added that these charges are passed on to private customers only. Mr. Allen requested an explanation of the charges. Mr. Chow responded that one is a Contribution In Aide of Construction tax, and the other is the income tax component to it. He added that this equates to approximately 39% of costs. Mr. Allen stated that DWP does not charge fellow members any such charges, but will charge direct and indirect costs. He added that DWP has a different tax structure than SCE, since DWP is a municipality. He reported that if engineering costs exceed what is in the Routine, than DWP charges on the JPA via Section 1.2 for additional engineering costs. Ms. Hernandez stated that in this situation, an additional invoice should not be generated. Mr. Chow replied that the purpose of generating an additional invoice is to coincide with a JPA, since many member utilities request a copy of the invoice that supports the additional Section 1.2 charges. Ms. Thomas added that a statement of charges corresponding to a JPA could be sent to members in lieu of an invoice; since an invoice denotes payment/reimbursement. Mr. Allen added that cable TV (and all other third parties) have always charged on a separate invoice. Ms. Hernandez responded that she has received preliminary JPAs with charges due to the initiator, that are returned to her organization with the charges lined out stating, “Bill to Follow”. Ms. Hernandez added that the bill is never received from the initiator; therefore, due to the charges lined out, the initiator would not get paid. Mr. Allen responded that the lined out items are being billed from a construction fund. Ms. Hernandez inquired as to where the billing invoice is sent. Mr. Allen responded that the invoices are sent directly to the wireless organization, and not the wireless member representative. Ms. Thomas responded that this process creates problems since the wireless company has missing, or multiple piece parts to a single site job. Ms. Thomas added that all charges should be covered on one JPA. Mr. Allen disagreed, in that the charges he speaks of are for engineering not covered in the Routine. Ms. Thomas responded that the Authorized Costs ad hoc invested time in discussing additional engineering costs, and placed a cost column in the pole price matrix. Mr. Allen responded the cost is for the placement of poles, but not the additional engineering required for the placement of wireless equipment (antennas etc).

Mr. Chow added that whether Section 7.3, or Section 7.11 is utilized, transfer costs are billed separately in order to recoup SCE costs equitably.

After further discussion, Ms. Hernandez stated that she would like clarification in that less than 20-year members should not be treated as third-parties. For clarification purposes, the consensus is that members that have less than 20 years with the SCJPC **should not** be considered, or treated as a third party when utilizing Section 7.3.

Lastly, Ms. Prouty raised the issue of clarification in regards to hand dig. Ms. Prouty reported that her organization has recently received numerous hand dig JPAs. She would like clarification when and/or what situation constitutes a hand dig. She explained a situation when a construction crew dug three feet down to determine if there is water, gas and/or a pipe. She

questioned the members, if this situation would be considered a hand dig. All responded that this is not a hand-dig situation. Ms. Prouty stated that she is of the same opinion, however, her organization is receiving JPAs explaining this situation, and charging hand dig. The members reviewed Section 14.9. Ms. Hernandez read notes taken from a field meet in 2001 with the City of Los Angeles, SCE, and Pacific Bell attending. Discussed was:

- That there would be NO hand dig charges for pole set in the same hole.
- That there would be NO hand dig charges for pole in rear property or on property line.
- If after the fact a hand dig charge is warranted, the charge would be added via Form 48 and/or Form 7.
- The USA marking within 3' of the pole would indicate that the hand dig charge was applicable.

Ms. Hernandez stated that the dig alert should be completed, and hand dig is not to explore. It was agreed to place the above-stated bullet points on the Clarification web site section of Section 14.9.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m. The next meeting would be scheduled at the next board meeting.

.

Jean Baccus, Assistant Office Manager

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

June 20, 2006

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. Velma Prouty – AT&T California
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 10:30 a.m. There is currently, only one agenda issue and that is **Item 1407: Proposed Revision to Section 4.1.** This pertains to unauthorized attachments. SCE is proposing revisions to this section (see attachment). Ms. Prouty stated that it appears that this proposal is imposing a double penalty. She added that instead of purchasing structural value at the cost of the year set, the member must purchase at the current year structural value. This in itself is a penalty, and to implement an additional \$500.00 per pole penalty fine, equates to a member imposing a double fine. Ms. Thomas, and Ms. Hernandez agreed that it appears as though members are double penalized, and agreed with Ms. Prouty. Ms. Prouty added that AT&T California would support one of the two above-mentioned penalties, but not both.

Mr. Chow replied that upon his return to his organization, he would review and research this issue further. He added that he would inquire if there were any possibility of maintaining the purchasing structural pole value at the year set, and not at the structural value of the current year.

This item is to remain open pending on the results acquired by Mr. Chow from his organization.

There were no miscellaneous items.

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m. until August 9, 2006.

.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

ATTACHMENT

4.1 Unauthorized Attachment

Each case requiring joint ownership in a pole shall constitute an unauthorized attachment if the Member making such attachment **begins construction and** fails to initiate Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization. Said Member shall be required to purchase interest at **the current year (regardless of the year set of the pole)** structural value and pay an added **\$500 per pole penalty** as per date Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization is issued.

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

September 14, 2006

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:

Ms. Velma Prouty – AT&T California
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Mr. Steve Rodriguez – T-Mobile USA
Mr. Viset Ong – City of Riverside
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 9:15 a.m. The one issue on the agenda is **Item 1407: Proposed Revision to Section 4.1.** This item is pending on action from SCE, however, Mr. Chow stated that his organization is not ready to report on this issue at this time.

Under miscellaneous items Mr. Chow stated that he would like to propose some editions to the Form 9 example 10, on page 18-15. In the diagram, the reference to the clock is inconsistent, and appears misleading. The members discussed this diagram, and made the corrections. The changes would be made on the website.

Ms. Corella stated that she had a question for miscellaneous items. She stated that this issue deals with pole inspections. She inquired if a member, who is not the base owner, but is attached to the pole, is allowed to inspect the pole and charge for pole inspections. She added that the situation that prompted this is when SCE inspected a DWP pole. SCE is not the base owner, but is legally attached. SCE billed all members on the pole for inspection. Then DWP inspects the pole shortly there after, and bills SCE and all other joint utilities on the pole. Ms. Corella added that the question is, may a joint member on the pole who is not the base owner inspect a pole. Ms. Prouty responded that AT&T California will pay for the first inspection, whether it be SCE or DWP, and will line out the second inspection. The other joint members added that their method of avoiding double charges is handled in a similar method.

Ms. Corella reiterated that the question is if it is allowed to have two members inspect a pole within a specified timeframe. Ms. Hernandez stated that once a final JPA has been submitted to this office, there should be no questions asked, since all joint parties should agree upon all items.

Ms. Baccus and Ms. Greene were invited to the meeting to clarify the issue in question. Ms. Baccus and Ms. Greene reiterated the concern about a pole inspected by a joint member that is not the base owner. Mr. Allen responded that for the time being, both power utilities are allowed, and mandated, to inspect the poles.

Ms. Baccus stated that the staff has been under the impression that poles should be inspected approximately every 10 to 15 years. She added that Ms. Sandy Allred has informed

her, that inspections could be within 5 years. Ms. Baccus added that when pole cards are updated with inspection, they do not identify the type of inspection, only that the pole has been inspected. Mr. Allen stated that this issue of both power utility members inspecting poles is an issue to be addressed between the two joint pole owners.

Ms. Hernandez interjected and requested clarification on time frames for inspection. Mr. Allen responded that for intrusive inspections, the time limit is every fifteen years, and it is mandated that all poles in your system be visually inspected annually per GO 165.

Ms. Greene presented a scenario to the members. She stated that SCE inspected an Anaheim based pole, and SCE was not a joint member on the pole. She questioned if this situation is acceptable. Mr. Chow responded that in many instances, the inspection crews inspect a line, and may not notice that SCE is not on this particular pole, because it is very difficult when poles are on the fringe areas. He added that identification of communication lines is simpler than identifying power. Ms. Greene questioned if the JPC staff should, or should not bill in this situation. Ms. Greene was instructed to bill this type inspection. The consensus is that it is the responsibility of the City of Anaheim, and all other joint members, to catch this type error, and to contact SCE, or other joint members, to request a correction. It is each respective member utilities responsibility to insure that a final bill is correct or not.

The members discussed whether it is the responsibility of the JPC staff to question such discrepancies, or to act as a clearinghouse and be assured that the members are in agreement at all times on the JPAs. Mr. Allen stated that the staff is seasoned enough to recognize a discrepancy, therefore, the members must give them direction of whether to question or not question. Ms. Prouty added that the staff should be allowed to question, and make phone calls.

The consensus is that when the initiator of a JPA is not on record as a joint owner, the JPC staff must contact the initiator to correct their records, and the JPC staff will hold and/or return the JPA until the initiator has made the correction on the JPA. Mr. Chow stated that an understanding should be reached, because in this case presented by Ms. Greene; the discrepancy is on one line in a huge stack of documents. SCE will have an issue if the entire inspection JPA is returned. In this case, the JPC staff is to contact the initiator of this huge stack of documents, and call them to notify them that they would line this pole out and continue.

Ms. Hernandez interjected, and stated that if a huge JPA is incorrect and sent to the JPC office, and the JPC staff contacts the initiator; chances are that the other joint owners would not become aware of an item being lined out until the final is received. She added that she does not have a problem with inspections, but would have problem with all other type JPAs. It was agreed that the line out rule would apply only to inspection JPAs.

Mr. Allen questioned if the type of inspection is noted on the pole records. The members responded that it does not state on the pole record the type of inspection, only that the pole has been inspected. Mr. Allen stated that, in his opinion, the JPC database pole record should denote the type of inspection (ex; visual, intrusive, etc). The members agreed that this notation would be of value to the joint members. The Routine authorized cost codes are 12 (a, b, c, and d) for identification of the different type of inspections. The consensus is that the JPC staff must denote the type of inspection on the pole card record. There are four inspection types in authorized costs, they are denoted as 12(a), (b), (c), and (d). Ms. Corella stated that the City of Los Angeles quotes their type of inspection with the AC code. SCE quotes the method of inspection by text, (ex: sound and bore/partial dig). Ms. Thomas stated by the City of Pasadena also identifies inspections by text; however, her staff writes the AC codes on the JPA. Mr. Allen stated, that in his opinion, there should be a standard for reflecting what type of inspection on the JPA. He suggested that all member utilities denote the type of inspection by using the AC codes. Mr. Chow responded that he would check with his staff if the inspection type can be noted on the preliminary inspection JPAs by the codes, and not by text. Mr. Allen added that the issue is not whether it is text or codes, but that the members need to agree about a standard.

The members questioned if when the final inspection JPA is returned for final billing, does SCE state the number of poles billed of each respective code. Ms. Corella responded that the final is not returned as mentioned. All agreed that SCE should state the number of poles billed at each individual inspection codes.

Mr. Allen inquired if there is a manual stating billing directions for the staff. Ms. Corella responded that other than the billing directions in the Routine handbook, there is no record of billing direction decided by the ad hoc committees for the JPC staff. Ms. Corella stated that the committee minutes normally reflect any agreed upon billing direction. Mr. Allen proposed that a manual should be compiled with the minutes, billing directions, or some agreement among the members that is not reflected in the handbook. Ms. Corella stated that normally she uses the item number list to locate past issues. The item list has the date the item was opened, and when it was resolved. However, it was agreed that a manual would make research easier. **Item Number 1423: Standardization of Procedures and Minutes** has been assigned to the Operating committee for further discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m. until October 3, 2006.

.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

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

November 14, 2006

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. Velma Prouty – AT&T California
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS
Mr. Raymond Tyler – Verizon California
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Mr. Justine Cashmer – Verizon California
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 9:20 a.m.

Mr. Tyler apologized for his lack of attendance on behalf of Verizon California. He added that a replacement for the position of representative has been assigned. He introduced Mr. Justin Cashmer to the members, and the members reciprocated.

The first item on the agenda is **Item 1407: Proposed Revision to Section 4.1**. Ms. Prescott inquired if SCE has submitted the SCE desktop procedure pertaining to this item for committee review. Mr. Chow responded that he believes he emailed it to Ms. Corella. Ms. Corella responded that she did not receive the email. Mr. Chow stated that he would send the procedure document to Ms. Corella to distribute to the members. This item would remain open into the next year.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1422: Annual Review of Open Agenda Items**. There are only two open items assigned to this ad hoc, and, Ms. Prescott stated that both items would be rolled over into next year. This item is closed.

The last topic for discussion is **Item 1427: Space/Grade on Engineered Steel Poles**. Ms. Hernandez opened the discussion by stating that SCE was to research if there are any such joint poles in the field. Ms. Hernandez stated that the issue is that this type poles are not set in the ground. They are placed on platforms. Therefore, a 45-foot pole is really 45 feet, since the pole is not set in the ground. The formula being used in the Routine Handbook is for poles that are set in the ground, not placed on platforms. A formula must be created for allocating space and grade on this type of pole. She suggested the top grade be labeled 45, and not 39 as in wood poles. The consensus is to have SCE locate a joint engineered steel pole. Ms. Hernandez stated that even if a joint engineered steel pole is not located, but in the future there is the possibility that this type pole could be joint, a discussion on space and grade allocation is warranted. The

members discussed this issue, and agreed that this item should remain open, and rolled over into next year.

There were no miscellaneous items for discussion, or new assigned item numbers.

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 a.m. until October 3, 2006.

.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations