

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

January 9, 2007

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

Ms. Velma Prouty – AT&T California
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS
Mr. Justin Cashmer – Verizon California
Ms. Brandi Coonce – Cingular Wireless
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff

Ms. Prescott opened the meeting at 12:05 pm, and addressed the first item on the agenda, **Item 1407: Proposed Revision to Section 4.1**. Ms. Prescott queried Mr. Chow if he had the SCE desktop procedure pertaining to this issue. Mr. Chow stated that he is under the impression, that he emailed Ms. Corella the documents. Ms. Corella responded that she did not receive any documents on desktop procedures. Mr. Chow added that he would send the procedures to Ms. Corella upon returning to his office.

The last open issue for discussion on the agenda is **Item 1427: Space/Grade on Engineered Steel Poles**. Ms. Prescott stated that Cingular Wireless brought this issue to the table, and that the members had agreed to attempt to locate any joint engineered steel poles. Ms. Prouty added that she had a picture of such a pole. She added that the issue is how to allocate space and record grade on an engineered steel pole, since the pole sits on a pedestal, and there is no structure in the ground. Ms. Prescott stated that it appears there is no urgency to this concern; therefore, she recommends tabling this item until the next ad hoc meeting, when Ms. Hernandez would return.

Under miscellaneous items Mr. Allen stated that he would like to open discussion, and clarify Routine Section 9.4 Replacement of Removal of Pole. Mr. Allen read the section on intersets poles. He stated that when this type pole is replaced it should remain section 9.4, treated as a clearance attachment, and not apply section 7. The members agreed that section 7 should not apply if the pole maintains its clearance attachment status. Mr. Allen stated that he corrected a JPA that was completed incorrectly.

Ms. Jean Baccus opened discussion with a list of Routine section questions submitted by the JPC staff. She added that the JPC office is soliciting direction when these issues become questionable on a finalized JPA. **The first question pertains to AC items 19A,B, and C.** What costs should be used when this item appears on a JPA dated prior to establishment of these costs.

The members discussed this issue extensively. Ms. Goetz stated that in her opinion, this issue has been discussed previously, and the consensus is to use the cost the first year it was implemented. Ms. Prescott agreed, and added that if the JPA is signed, then the joint members have agreed on the cost, and the JPC office should process the JPA. Everyone is aware that Section 18.1 does not apply in this scenario. The final consensus is to return any JPA that has a prepared date, and an authorized cost that was established at a later date than the prepared date. If the JPA has a notation on the body specifying the year of AC costs applicable, and that all members have signed the JPA, and are in agreement of using the specified and agreed upon AC.

In regards to **AC 19-A**, Ms. Baccus inquired that when a pole is replaced via section 7.11, 7.4, and the replacement pole is an E-all, should Item 19A be charged? Without discussion, the members agreed that the answer to this question is no.

The next issue raised by Ms. Baccus is in regards to **Section 7.7**. Ms. Baccus stated that the JPC office was instructed to bill just one foot of unauthorized pole replacement attachment. She inquired if this rule continues to apply, or bill as shown (ex: 23-5, 22-2 etc.). She added that some JPA's are received at the JPC office showing the grade (ex: 22), but not the space down, while other JPA's do show grade as well as space. She inquired what should the standard procedure in this instance require, since nothing is stated as such in the Routine Handbook. Ms. Thomas stated that it is the responsibility of the fielder to note the footage. Ms. Baccus then inquired if in this instance the footage is missing, should the JPA be returned. Ms. Prouty stated that in her opinion, the JPA should be returned. Mr. Chow stated that the JPA should be billed as shown (ex: 23-5), since both parties have agreed. The consensus is that if a JPA is received in the JPC office pertaining to Section 7.7, and reflects the grade, but is missing the space, the JPA must be returned for lack of space notation.

Next, Ms. Baccus stated her concern in regards to **inspections**. The question is how far back may a member bill another member for a backdated pole inspection. Ms. Thomas stated that, at a prior meeting, the committee had agreed on three years. The additional verbiage that has been added to Section 2.7-H to address this issue reads as follows: **"All inspections/inspection and treatment joint pole authorizations will be final billed within three years of inspection date. Inspections completed prior to the members Board approval date, cannot be billed to other members."**

The last concern raised to the ad hoc members concerns the **Form 7**. It was brought to the attention of this ad hoc, that the JPC office is receiving copies of Form 7's that should not be CC'd to the JPC office. Ms. Baccus reported that the JPC office currently have an entire drawer filled with unresolved Form 7's. Mr. Chow stated that a process should be implemented that when a Form 7 is cc'd to the JPC office, and it is resolved, then the JPC office must be notified to release or cancel the Form 7. Billing on many JPA's are delayed because the JPC office is holding an open Form 7 against a particular JPA. Ms. Goetz interjected and stated that the problem is that members are copying every type of Form 7 to the JPC office, thus resulting in delayed billing of many JPAs where the issues have been corrected and/or resolved. She added that the ad hoc should identify which type Form 7's should be copied to the JPC office, and all others should be returned to the issuing member. This has inundated the JPC office with unresolved Form 7's. The consensus is that the JPC office should not receive copies of Form 7's for minor corrections that should be made by a member on any given preliminary JPA. Only joint members on the preliminary JPA should receive a copy of the Form 7. The ad hoc will create a list of those Form 7 concerns that should be CC'd to the JPC office. In the interim the only type of Form 7's to be sent to the JPC office are 1) a protest, (2) a correction of location, (3) record tenant attachment, and (4) remove temporary attachment.

The final question put to the ad hoc members is in regards to JPA corrections. Ms. Baccus inquired if in a situation when a correction is requested by one joint member to another joint member in the preliminary process of the JPA, is it the responsibility of the JPC office to ensure that the corrected party did in fact make the correction when the final JPA is received by the JPC staff. Mr. Chow stated that it is not the responsibility of the JPC office to ensure that members are correctly following the JPA process; it is the responsibility of the members to follow the process and communicate with one another. Ms. Prouty added that in her experience, she is finding that members are not making the Form 7 corrections, and are sending the final JPA's to the JPC office without correction. Therefore, in her opinion, it is incumbent on the JPC office to ensure that the corrections have been made. Mr. Chow disagreed and reiterated that checking if a member has made a correction when a JPA is in preliminary status should not be the responsibility of the JPC office. He added that in the current JPA process utilized between AT&T California, and SCE, that SCE would notify AT&T California that any corrections noted by AT&T California are in fact corrected by SCE prior to sending the JPA to the JPC office.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m. until February 2007.

.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

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

February 13, 2007

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. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Ms. Kourtney Aboudara – NextG Networks
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting at 9:10 am, and addressed **Item 1407: Proposed Revision to Section 4.1**. Ms. Hernandez questioned Mr. Chow if he had the SCE desktop procedure pertaining to this issue. Mr. Chow responded that he would contact his office and would have the procedures document to the members prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Chow stated that at the previous meeting, there was discussion that the \$500.00 penalty was too punitive. However, he added that SCE is of the opinion that the fee is equitable in regards to what is entailed when handling unauthorized attachments, and those entities that are truly attached illegally. Ms. Hernandez responded that she recollects the discussion, and agrees that the fee appears equitable. However, there are too many instances when members are charged unauthorized attachments, and when the suspected offending member researches the JPA, it is discovered that they are not illegally attached. It is discovered that the offending entity is not attached at all, it is a tenant, or they are legally attached according to their respective records. Ms. Haney added that the research process of this transaction is an unnecessary cost to the other party. Mr. Chow responded that all members, in the course of processing JPA's, are expected to research any suspected discrepancies. He added that SCE researches all Form 7's resulting in expensed resources that are not recovered. Ms. Haney reiterated that it appears the suspected violating member has the burden, and expense of proving that they are not unauthorized. Ms. Goetz questioned the percentage of such occurrences. Ms. Prouty responded that the rate in which this situation occurs is often enough to warrant serious consideration, and discussion before approving the \$500.00 penalty.

Ms. Hernandez added that the ad hoc is requesting the SCE desktop procedure currently utilized by SCE for identifying unauthorized attachments. After the ad hoc has reviewed, and approved this document, then the ad hoc would move forward with this issue. This item would remain open at this time.

The next issue for discussion on the agenda is **Item 1427: Space/Grade on Engineered Steel Poles**. Ms. Hernandez stated that the issue with engineered steel poles is that they sit on a platform, and there is no part of the structure that is in the ground. Therefore, when allocating

space on this type poles, the table (Section 16.1) currently used for allocating space on wood poles could not apply to engineered steel poles.

The members discussed this issue. It was agreed to identify engineered steel poles using ES. This would be added to Section 15.7 Alternative to Wood Poles. The members discussed creating a table for ES poles. The table would be added to Section 16.1. Since there is no part of the pole in the ground, the entire space of the pole would be allocated.

It was agreed to edit Sections 4, 5, and 7 to refer to ES poles.

Under miscellaneous items Mr. Allen inquired the time frame for billing inspections. The response is that an inspection JPA may be billed up to three years after the official date of inspection.

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 a.m. until March 2007.

.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

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

March 13, 2007

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 (teleconference)
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Kourtney Aboudara – NextG Networks
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting at 9:05 am, and addressed Item **1407: Proposed Revision to Section 4.1**. Mr. Chow has provided the ad hoc members with a copy of the Surveillance Inspector Desktop Procedures. He stated that when an inspector identifies an illegal attachment, they follow the desktop procedures. He led the members through the process, and explained how every step of the procedure is handled.

Ms. Prouty referred to a JPA that her office received reflecting that H was unauthorized. After some research it was discovered that H was not illegally attached but the cable was either E communication, or another utility. Mr. Chow requested a copy of the JPA for his research. He added that inspectors are not able to identify ownership of every piece of equipment; therefore, there are some errors. However, they are able to differentiate between cable TV, fiber optics, and communication cable.

Ms. Prouty suggested that since H had to expense resources to justify that they are not illegally attached, perhaps a penalty of \$500.00 should be charged to E.

Mr. Chow responded that in his opinion, this issue is another topic of discussion. In the processing of JPAs between members, it is incumbent on all members to verify accuracy of information. He added that all members receive JPA's where inaccuracies are discovered after having expensed resources. In his opinion the error mentioned by Ms. Prouty is an example of an inaccuracy. He added that when E receives JPAs from members requesting to purchase interest, and E discovers inaccuracies in the documents, he questioned would it then be allowed for E to impose a penalty fine for the E expensed resources. He added that in all fairness, the committee should not allow a penalty for just one type of inaccuracy. If inaccuracy penalties are allowed, then it should apply to every type of inaccurate situation. He added that in his opinion, it would not be fair and equitable.

Ms. Prouty stated that she raised this question, because E added a \$500.00 fee in regards to 4.1. Therefore, in her opinion, H should be compensated for expensing resources to prove they are not in violation. Mr. Chow reiterated that members are not compensated when they expense

resources to prove inaccurate information. Ms. Prouty stated in the instances where H discovers E illegally attached, they do not impose an additional penalty fee, they correct the records.

Mr. Chow stated that this proposal is not merely for the benefit of SCE, it would benefit all members. He stated that he is aware that incoming members are attaching to poles, prior to initiating a JPA, and gaining approval. This is a problem for SCE, as well as other members. He added that the driver behind this proposal is that the current 50% penalty for violating members is not severe enough to impact incoming members. Perhaps, they are working in the 50% penalty in their projected budget.

Ms. Hernandez interjected, and stated that originally, she opposed the \$500.00 penalty when she represented SBC, and currently LAC, because both members do not intentionally illegally attach, and she was offended that SCE would propose a \$500.00 penalty. She added that her then opinion was that the SCJPC is a partnership, and members should not penalize one another, and the issue that SCE was in the habit of charging unauthorized attachments habitually when in fact there was no violation. She added that today, she is of the opinion that the current penalty for section 4.1 is no longer a deterrent toward unauthorized attachment. She shared a personal experience in which she overheard a construction personnel remark, when accused of this violation, quoted "so bill me". It appears the benefit of attaching illegally outweighs the unauthorized attachment penalty, since the incoming member is conducting business and collecting revenue immediately, rather than waiting for the entire JPA process to be completed. She added that she is now of the opinion that this issue requires serious consideration. It appears that the 50% penalty is no longer a deterrent to illegal attachment.

The members discussed several scenarios and instances in regards to this issue. The members stated that a majority of Section 4.1 JPAs sent to them from SCE has resulted in reflecting that the joint member is not unauthorized.

After extensive discussion, the consensus among the ad hoc members is to clearly identify what constitutes an unauthorized attachment. Prior to further considering this proposal to Section 4.1, the members would clearly document and define unauthorized attachments.

It was agreed that the action for this issue is for Ms. Corella to send the proposed revision to Section 4.1 to all members, and solicit their definition of what constitutes an unauthorized attachment.

Under miscellaneous items, Ms. Corella opened discussion on the footer portion of the Routine Handbook. Currently, when a section is revised, the lower right footer states the revision month and year. Ms. Corella stated that previously, it was agreed that any section revisions would be noted in parenthesis at the end of the section. She suggested rather than stating, "rev. xxx", to state at the lower right hand footer, "Reviewed month, year". It was agreed that the lower right hand footer would quote the edition of the handbook, (ex. 2007 Edition). The lower left would quote the date the handbook was reviewed in its entirety.

Lastly, the members discussed Section 18.1-C. An additional sub-section has been added.

Item 1434: Non-Useable Space GO rule 94.4 b&c. This addresses issues raised at the last GO meeting in regards to wireless equipment, and additional two feet allowance.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m. until April 17, 2007.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

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

April 17, 2007

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 10:15 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Velma Prouty – AT&T California
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Kourtney Aboudara – NextG Networks
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Mr. Daniel Lippert – City of Burbank
Mr. Steve Rodriguez – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by stating that the agenda items should note which member brought the issue to the table.

The first issue on the agenda is **Item 1407: Proposed Revision to Section 4.1**. Prompted from the prior ad hoc meeting, members were emailed with a query for a definition of an unauthorized attachment. Ms. Baccus stated that there is one response from the City of Lompoc, which reads, “any attachment that is not pre-approved by the City”.

Mr. Chow stated that in his opinion, if a hard-fast definition is written for unauthorized attachment, then the flexibility is lost. Since this issue represents many different scenarios. He added that flexibility and workability is lost when rigid definitions are set.

Ms. Goetz stated that what prompted this issue is the method of attaching Altrio Communications had practiced in the past, which resulted in loss revenue to members.

Ms. Prescott stated that members are attaching prior to processing a Form 2. Since the action is not approved, then it is an unauthorized attachment.

Ms. Prouty stated that it is incumbent on members to maintain in their respective databases free attachment information. The JPC office does not maintain this information in their database. Therefore, this scenario is not unauthorized.

Mr. Chow stated that since members do not have access to each other’s database, there is no method of verifying free attachment. This method proves time ineffective.

Ms. Prouty responded that when the freely attached member receives the Form 2, their action is to line out the 4.1 on the JPA.

Mr. Chow reiterated that this method is time ineffective. He added that in his opinion, each individual situation requires some research.

The members discussed definitions for an unauthorized attachment, and the proposed verbiage to the section.

The proposed revision to Section 4.1 was agreed upon. The proposed revisions reads as follows, "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 or constructs prior to approval of 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 \$500.00 per pole penalty as per date Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization". This item would be on the discussion calendar of the April Board meeting.

It was decided to create a section for billing directives. This section is titled: "Structural Value of Unauthorized Attachment. It reads, "Structural value is billed at date of Form 2. Penalty will be distributed and credited back to members of record and charged to Member attaching unauthorized".

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1433: Fiberglass Wrap/Stub Maintenance Program inclusions**. This is an Edison issue in that they would like to include these actions in their Board approved maintenance program. This would allow SCE to bill for these actions, as is done with inspections.

It was agreed to place this issue on the discussion calendar of the April Board meeting.

The third issue on the agenda is **Item 1434: Non-Useable Space GO Rule 94.4-B&BC**. Ms. Hernandez brought this issue to the table. It is in reference to wireless companies soon to be mandated to have a 2-foot clearance for their antennas. Ms. Hernandez stated that she is seeking clarification and understanding on this issue. She is of the opinion that the two feet mandated by general order should not require purchasing, but should be treated as non-useable footage until the wireless company attaches into the clearance zone. She added that when a member attaches into the power safety zone, that member does not purchase until attachment. She added that the two-foot wireless clearance zone should be treated as such.

The members then questioned if only the wireless company requiring the safety zone can purchase into the two-feet of clearance, or may any joint member purchase.

Mr. Chow stated that he believes the reason why only the wireless company may be allowed to purchase into the two-feet safety is because, the workers are aware of the dangers connected to working within the zone.

Ms. Hernandez restated her concern with this general order. She is of the opinion that any member who attaches into the clearance zone should purchase the space, but in the interim, should be treated as common area, which is assessed to all joint owners as non-useable footage.

The members agreed that they are not clear on who is allowed to attach into the clearance zone. Ms. Hernandez agreed that there is lack of clarification on the specifics of the general rule. However, she continues to be of the opinion that the mandated two-feet should be non-useable footage until purchased.

It was agreed to further research this general order for clarification, and discuss this issue at the next ad hoc.

The last open issue on the agenda is **Item 1436: Compliance with Routine Handbook..** Mr. Chow opened by stating what prompted this issue is linked to Item 1407. He added that discussion is required on how to deal with members that do not comply with the Routine Handbook. He added that in conversations he has had, it appears that some members are taking a literal translation of the Routine as it is written. They lack the knowledge and history to enable them to understand the purpose of the Routine. Mr. Brown stated that the Routine is a planner, and must be clear and concise enough in order to leave nothing to the imagination. Mr. Chow stated that in his opinion it is not written as such. It is written for readers who are already quite familiar with the history and purpose of the Joint Pole Committee. He added that the JPC is A) a business relationship, and, B) the

transactions on the final JPA is based on what is agreed upon by the parties involved, whether it is defined in the Routine or not.

Ms. Hernandez stated that perhaps the JPC should return to training new members.

Ms. Chow stated that prior to implementing a class on completing a preliminary JPA, there should be a class to explain the history, and the original true purpose of why there is a Southern California Joint Pole Committee. He added that from the perspective of SCE, too many members are hiding behind the Routine Handbook instead of making a phone call to other members.

Ms. Hernandez stated that what is needed is a statement of what the intent is of the Joint Pole Committee. She added that the members would need to compile the statements, and verbiage to be included in the explanation of the JPC.

Ms. Prescott suggested taking a section per month and arrive at an explanation for that section.

Ms. Thomas stated that the members that are experiencing the greatest problems with interpretation are the new members, and they fail to attend meetings.

Ms. Hernandez stated the representatives are failing to relay any pertinent information to the necessary personal.

It was agreed to rename this item to read, "Compliance with Routine Handbook/Training.

Under miscellaneous items the following issues were discussed. **Section 1.2, establishing a pole record that exists in the field** was brought to the table by AT&T California. Ms. Prouty inquired how is a pole record created when one member discovers it in the field, and places it on the JPA. Ms. Baccus answered that it is agreed upon by all parties via 1.2. This issue would be discussed further at the next meeting.

Ms. Baccus inquired how to handle a JPA with a non-member on it, and should it be billed via a Form 44. The members stated that it should be handled in this manner since many non-members continue to be attached to poles.

The members discussed the changes (no verbiage added, only the order of verbiage rearranged) for Section 18.1-C. The revisions were approved by the ad hoc, and they would be on the discussion calendar of the next Administrative Board meeting.

The next topic discussed is **wind loading**, brought to the table by Cingular Wireless. Ms. Thomas opened by stating that SCE is denying JPA's due to wind loading. Ms. Chow responded that they are not denied due to wind loading, but because SCE is not receiving required information.

Ms. Thomas added that her primary concern is can a JPA be denied due to wind loading. Mr. Chow reiterated that JPAs are not denied based on wind loading alone. Ms. Thomas added that there is nothing in the Routine that alludes to wind loading. Mr. Chow agreed that there nothing in the Routine. Ms. Thomas added that the members should have written documentation of the criteria required by SCE in regards to wind loading.

The members agreed that different wind loading calculations are utilized by members.

The members discussed this extensively, and agreed that this issue requires further discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m., and will meet on May 8 2007.

Jean Baccus, Assistant Manager of Operations

(jc)

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

May 8, 2007

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 11:40 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Velma Prouty – AT&T California
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Robert Allen – City of LA (teleconference)
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS (teleconference)
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff

The first issue on the agenda is **Item 1407: Proposed Revision to Section 4.1**. Ms. Prouty opened discussion by stating that AT&T California would not support the proposed revision at this time. She added that her organization is choosing to maintain the section as it stands today.

Mr. Allen stated that he has witnessed facilities attached without any regard to the JPA process.

Mr. Chow reiterated that the driver behind this proposal is to curve those members that are constructing against denied JPAs, JPAs not approved, and with General Order infractions. He stated that currently, NextG is practicing these type transactions. They are building facilities prior to joint member approval. The primary reason behind this proposal is to deter members from attaching to poles unauthorized, and in his opinion the penalty must be stiff enough to discourage this type of business practice within the SCJPC. He added that this would not deter members from communicating with one another, and agree to change a section 4.1 to a section 4.0.

Ms. Thomas stated that she received an email from Mr. Tibor Laky, of Sprint Communications, LP, in regards to this item number. Ms Thomas read the email to the members, which reads as follows:

“I will be unable to participate in tomorrow's meeting. I would appreciate it if one of you would bring the essence of this idea to the table. Sprint concurs with the need to discourage unauthorized attachments. The concept of hitting the offending party with a \$500 penalty sounds good in theory but will result in litigation and a significant amount of wasted time on the part of the board. I would rather see the offending party be billed by the committee, on behalf of all of the owners with interest in that (those) specific pole and the bill be comprised of real costs.

Those costs would include:

- 1) Current pole space cost,*
- 2) Cost of 3rd party engineering analysis of the pole,*
- 3) Internal Labor cost, plus all overheads, for each committee member that is affected,*

- 4) *All costs and overheads associated with activity on the part of committee staff,*
- 5) *Cost of legal review by SCJPC counsel prior to sending the bill*

In addition, the cost would escalate by the fair market rent for each month that the attachment continues to exist plus 1 items 3, 4 & 5 above. This would far exceed the \$500 and would be defensible in any court. The cost would be draconian but would be more of a deterrent than \$500.”

Ms. Thomas stated that she would be contacting Mr. Laky for clarification; however, it appears that Mr. Laky is of the opinion that \$500.00 is not much of a deterrent to 4.1.

Ms. Prescott added that she too received the email from Mr. Laky. She added that in his opinion, members could include this penalty in their budget. Mr. Laky feels that \$500.00 is not enough of a deterrent.

Mr. Chow stated that in his opinion, the cost of purchasing at the current year cost of the pole is punitive enough to create a fiscal impact on a members project budget. He added that a legal review by SCJPC counsel is not necessary because, all members are part of the Committee of their own respective volition.

Mr. Chow stated that the \$500.00 is based on the Pulsiver right of way decision, D98-10-058, language in appendix A, section XI B-1, titled Pricing and Tariffs governing access D-Unauthorized Attachment II .

The members discussed what actions might be taken against an offending member per the 1998 Agreement. Mr. Chow stated that he believes the only clause to place a member in poor standing, according to the agreement, is if they are in arrears of monetary payment to the SCJPC or joint members. The members read the agreement, and it appears that Mr. Chow is correct.

The members discussed the different infractions, and non-compliance that some members are practicing.

Ms. Prescott suggested contacting the legal counsel, and inquiring if there is any legal action the Committee is allowed in the SCJPC 1998 Agreement in regards to members that are not in compliance with the Routine Handbook, and SCJPC practices.

Mr. Chow stated, in speaking for SCE, taking legal action with a joint member would warrant extensive discussion within his respective organization.

It was agreed to place this issue on the discussion calendar of the next Administrative Board meeting.

Mr. Chow stated that the SCJPC should not appear as restraining trade by delaying a member the ability to attach their facilities. He suggested creating a process where a member faced with having to provide a service to customers within a specific date, and is in a difficult situation, to have the freedom to move forward. However, some guidelines would be required.

Ms. Prescott stated that currently, all members are free to schedule a field meet to address any difficult situations.

The consensus is that since it appears that NextG is currently practicing non-compliance, that a meeting should be scheduled with them to discuss the members concerns. There is the possibility that NextG is not aware that their contractors are in non-compliance. The members discussed the topics for discussion, and they are:

- Constructing without JPA
- SCJPC 1998 Agreement non-compliance
- Constructing after a JPA was denied
- Building GO 95 infractions
- Denying request for extensions
- Wind load information – instances where all info is the same (i.e.: same HOA and SPAN)

The members agreed to contact NextG, and inquire if they could meet with the ad hoc the week of May 21st.

Ms. Hernandez returned to the discussion on Item 1407. She stated that the ad hoc was informed by SCE that they have redesigned their internal process of identifying illegal attachments. However, she added that she recently received a 4.1 JPA, and she stated that it was not unauthorized. She would like to be certain that if this proposal is approved, that SCE would restructure their internal process to prevent this type errors.

Mr. Chow responded that his organization is in the process of refining their desk-top procedures.

Mr. Cashmer stated that after some discussion within his organization, he would not support the proposed revision to section 4.1.

Ms. Hernandez stated that originally she was not supporting the proposal, however, in light of the NextG practices, she was in support. However, if the NextG situation could be remedied, she would rethink her stand.

Ms. Prouty stated that she is fine with the verbiage, "current year structural value", however, she would not support the additional \$500.00.

The members discussed this issue extensively, and arrived at the new proposed revised verbiage (see attachment).

The second issue on the agenda is **Item 1434: Non-Useable Space GO Rule 94.4-B&BC**. Ms. Hernandez opened discussion. She stated that this issue refers to the 2-foot safety clearance that is now required for wireless equipment. Mr. Chow reported that he researched this rule, and discovered that no one is allowed to attach within this two feet of safety clearance.

Ms. Hernandez brought this issue to the table. She is proposing that the required two feet of safety clearance be part of the common area, which is shared by joint members.

The members discussed different scenarios, and who could attach within the safety clearance. Mr. Brown stated that in his opinion, it appears that since no one is allowed to attach within the two feet, then it is non-usable space.

The consensus is to place this issue on the discussion calendar of the May 2007 Administrative Board meeting. The objective is to gain a consensus from the Board members that the 2 feet should be treated as common area. If the Board accepts this, than revisions to the Routine Handbook would be discussed.

The last open issue on the agenda is **Item 1436: Compliance with Routine Handbook**. Mr. Chow opened this discussion on PTD. He stated that his organization is receiving customer complaints about poles that have been left in the field. They were not PTD'd by the responsible party. He is requesting a name and phone number for a single point of contact to the person responsible for ensuring that the pole(s) in question, have been removed.

Ms. Corella would contact the members to solicit this information, and get the information to all the members via the web site.

The members discussed the issues and concerns to be included in the training sessions. The members discussed extensively, the concern of final billing JPAs out of sequential order, for clarification. This issue would be discussed further.

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion on PTX. She stated that she was under the impression that the pole height changed with a PTX. She is now aware that it does not change the pole height. After much discussion, it was agreed that the pole height should continue to remain the same, since there is not much to attach onto an extension.

Mr. Chow brought to the table an issue between SCE and AT&T California. He cited a situation where AT&T California is an owner on record. However, AT&T California is no longer attached, therefore, in the opinion of Ms. Prouty, they are not a joint owner. The communication that is attached is Verizon California, and they admit that they are illegally attached, and agree to PTD. However, Mr. Chow is of the opinion that AT&T California should share in the cost, since he has traced back the original JPA where AT&T California purchased.

The members discussed how to prepare the JPA so the transaction is equitable, in line with the Routine, and agreed by all joint members.

Lastly, Mr. Chow opened discussion on mod pole, and steel sleeve removal. He stated that some new members are taking the Routine Handbook literally. He added that he is curious as to why the removal of a steel sleeve, is treated as a removal of a mod pole. Both sections stated that steel sleeves, and mod poles are to be removed by installing member. He stated that removing a mod pole is greater in labor intensity than removing a steel sleeve. Therefore, he understands the need of the setting party to remove a mod pole; however, in his opinion, any member should be allowed to remove a steel sleeve, since it is relatively less labor-intensive. He is requesting clarification on section 2.7 –D (1) Steel Sleeve, where any member may remove it.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m., and will meet on June 12, 2007.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

ATTACHMENT

Item 1407: Proposed Revision to Section 4.1

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 **or constructs prior to approval of Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization, or constructs prior to approval of 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 50 % penalty. ~~\$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

June 12, 2007

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 10:15 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Velma Prouty – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Robert Allen – City of LA (teleconference)
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Steve Rodriguez – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Ms. Kourtney Aboudara – NextG Networks
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by notating two typos in the Routine Handbook. In the index-Section 14.1 has been added, and in Section 14.6 a correction in the first paragraph, the example should be page 18.14. The errors were noted, and the corrections would be made.

The first issue on the agenda is **Item 1407: Proposed Revision to Section 4.1**. Mr. Chow stated that since AT&T California, and Verizon California are the two members with primary issues concerning this proposal are absent, he proposed tabling this for the next meeting. Ms. Prouty is on teleconference, however, she agreed to table this issue since she would also prefer to be in attendance to discuss this issue further. The consensus is to hold this item over for further discussion at the next ad hoc meeting.

The second issue on the agenda is **Item 1434: Non-Useable Space GO Rule 94.4-B&BC**. Ms. Hernandez opened discussion. She stated the Board agreed to accept the required two feet of safety clearance to be treated as non-useable footage. However, the ad hoc must agree on a process of noting the 2-feet on the JPA, and creating and/or editing the current chart in Section 16.1.

Ms. Hernandez stated that she processed a JPA with this action. She added that since there is a lack of process, she allocated the space including the two-feet as clearance, and noted, “26-2 is safety clearance zone-two feet”. She stated that the current chart could not apply due to the additional safety clearance.

Ms. Hernandez inquired if the ad hoc should create a separate chart for wireless. The members agreed that the 30-foot pole would be the highest pole on the chart.

The members discussed the chart extensively. The consensus is to create a new chart inserting an additional column for the 2-feet of clearance, and present it to the Board at the next meeting.

The next open issue on the agenda is **Item 1436: Compliance with Routine Handbook**. Ms. Hernandez inquired if the members have any thoughts on how to approach this issue. Ms. Corella stated that in her opinion, it might not necessarily be training that is required, but education of the macro process of how the JPC operates. She added that the JPC office receives inquiries that are not related to the JPC office. The members suggested the JPC office take notation of any non-related phone calls. They reiterated that this type calls should be referred to the member representative.

The members are in agreement that a FAQ (frequently asked questions) page should be set up on the web. The ad hoc would compile these questions submitted from members, and the JPC staff office.

The course is to bring issues to the table where there is conflict in interpretation of any Routine Handbook section. The ad hoc would then discuss the section and arrive at an agreed upon interpretation and/or clarification.

Ms. Hernandez stated that she has an issue where she feels clarification is needed. She stated that in the situation where there is a pending JPA, and you are notified to add another member to the header, in her opinion one cannot add a member to a JPA via a Form 7. She added that a revised Form 2 is the method to use when adding a member to a JPA. She quoted Section 18.1-C (B). She stated if you send a Form 7 to all members on the JPA, and if the omitted members have any changes to add, then the other members on the JPA would not be aware of the omitted members changes. Ms. Hernandez stated that she notes the pending member on the header with a notation stating said member JPA must final prior to said JPA, and notes their grade and space. Mr. Chow stated that he disagrees, because a member should not list on the header if said member is not a member on record. Ms. Hernandez explained how she denotes the pending JPA on the later JPA. She added that this is necessary so that no two members vie for the same space and grade, which could happen when members are not informed.

Ms. Haney stated that the issue of two wireless companies vying for the same spot is more frequent today, than in the past. Mr. Rodriguez added that his organization is experiencing these problems as well, and in some instances have proved costly.

Ms. Hernandez reiterated that it must be stressed that it is incumbent on members to notify the initiating member on a JPA that there is a pending JPA, and this should not be communicated via a Form 7, but a Form 2.

The members discussed this issue extensively, and agreed that this process should become part of the training for incoming members, and those members unfamiliar with this process.

Mr. Chow raised a question in regards to training, and clarification in reference to Form 7's. He stated that he is of the opinion that a Form 7 is directly associated to a specific JPA, and not to be used as a blanket JPA. Ms. Corella stated that the JPC office has received blanket JPAs in the past. Mr. Chow added that if it is so stated in the Routine Handbook, he is in agreement, however, if it is not stated should blanket JPAs be accepted.

Ms. Hernandez stated that if a member is making a blanket request, the request should not be on a Form 7, but a notification on company letterhead addressed to all concerned.

Mr. Chow stated that in his opinion, the JPC should not act on a request from one specific member, if the request could impact all members. Perhaps, the request should be brought to the table and discussed among the members, since the JPC office serves the entire Committee as a unit. Therefore, in his opinion, the members should arrive at an understanding on this matter.

Ms. Hernandez stated that this is a good point, and in her opinion this type request should be read at the Administrative Board meeting as a communication.

The consensus on this issue is to discuss it at the next Administrative Board meeting.

The course for the ad hoc is to review Routine Handbook sections for interpretation, and clarification. The ad hoc would start with Section 18. Upon returning next month, the members will discuss any misconceptions with this section, and clarify all concerns.

The last issue on the agenda is Item 1439: Section 2.7-D Clarification. The consensus is to revise Section 2.7-D. Section 2.7-d (1) Steel Sleeve will be removed, (2) will become (1), and (3) will become (2). It was agreed that there would be a clarification link on the web, and this issue would become effective January 2008.

Under miscellaneous items, **wind loading** was discussed. Mr. Chow requested that all members desiring to attach to SCE poles should attach their respective wind-loading calculations to the preliminary Form 2 JPA. He added that providing the calculations initially, would aid in expediting the SCE internal process. Ms. Prescott inquired as to what calculations is SCE requesting. Mr. Chow responded those of the equipment that would be placed on the pole. This would allow SCE to identify what type/size equipment is being placed, and then SCE could work their internal calculations.

Ms. Prouty inquired if SCE perhaps could provide the calculations to other members prior to other members initiating a JPA, in order that they may run their respective calculations within their organization. This could possibly circumvent denial.

Mr. Chow responded that the JPA is not denied because the calculations are incorrect, but because the placement of their equipment could overload the pole, or possibly some other GO infraction.

Ms. Prouty stated she believes that wind loading has been a denial factor in one particular JPA instance. However, she added that she would research the JPA in question, and discuss it with him at the next meeting. Mr. Chow responded that he is curious to view the JPA in question. He added that any member might request the pole-loaded information from SCE to run their respective calculations.

Ms. Haney stated that it would aid those members that have been denied by SCE, to have SCE's calculations returned attached to the denied JPA. This would aid planners to determine their miscalculations.

Ms. Chow responded that this request is reasonable.

Ms. Hernandez inquired that SCE is denying JPA's due to wind loading. Mr. Chow responded the reason for denial is that members are not providing their calculations; therefore, SCE is unable to test their calculations. There are other instances where JPA's are received with calculations, but when the calcs are run through the SCE program, the pole fails.

Ms. Hernandez stated that in this instance the JPA is not literally denied. She added that she believes the JPA should be returned, but not denied. She stated that if the pole fails, and the initiating member truly desires to attach, then the pole requires replacement. Therefore, the JPA is not literally denied. It is incumbent on the initiating party to take whatever action required gaining access to the pole.

Ms. Prescott stated if Form 49 Tracer could have a spot on it to specify what is required by the initiating member to gain access to the pole.

Ms. Prouty stated that it should be noted in the Routine Handbook any member requirements. Ms. Hernandez suggested noting it as the current utilities that have approved maintenance programs are noted in the Routine section 2.7-H.

Ms. Prescott reiterated her suggestion of reformatting the form tracer to accommodate comments on why a JPA has been returned. In her opinion, she stated that the committee should not be noting anything pertaining to wind loading in the Routine Handbook since this is a GO issue.

Ms. Hernandez recapped on what has been discussed in regards to wind loading and SCE. She stated that:

1. SCE is requesting that all members interested in purchasing interest on joint poles to provide SCE with their respective wind loading calculations attached to the JPA.
2. Prior to initiating the JPA, the initiating party may contact SCE planner to obtain a profile of the said pole to provide and aid the initiating party with as much information when doing their respective calculations.

3. The Form 49 – Tracer will be updated to provide any requirements and/or comments by SCE, and the first revision draft would be presented to the ad hoc at their next meeting.

SCE will revise the Form 49 tracer to include the language they feel is needed to communicate with members.

Ms. Hernandez reiterated that if all the criteria are not included with the JPA, SCE would than return the JPA stating JPA unapproved with the Form 49 attached stating what is required in order for SCE to approve the JPA.

Mr. Chow stated that the term, “denied” has become such a common term that it may take some time before the staff becomes accustomed to the term, “unapproved”.

Ms. Haney questioned if on the revised Form 49, the contact name and number could be included, so that should a member have any concerns they may go directly to the source.

Ms. Hernandez stated that discussion should open for the situations when two members do not agree on whether the wind loading is acceptable or not.

Mr. Chow stated that in the wind loading software he is aware of, the formulas are similar. In his opinion the cause for a difference in results is the data input into the software. If members input the exact same data, then the results should be relatively similar.

The members would discuss these issues at the next meeting when SCE returns with the revised Form 49.

Under miscellaneous items, Ms. Haney stated that NextG is receiving denials from SCE for older JPAs stating that the pole has been removed, but it has not been removed. She added that she would like SCE to be aware that NextG would be extensively investigating these denials.

Mr. Chow responded that this could be result of a glitch in the SCE system, where the pole might be on a work order to be removed, or the system reflects that the pole has been removed.

Ms. Haney reiterated that she wanted SCE to become aware of the investigating being performed by NextG Networks.

Ms. Baccus had a concern with a JPA and would like to discuss the sections used in this MP JPA. She stated that it was an MP all pole being replaced, and MP PTD, it was replaced 7.11, and H to purchase 4.0 on the new pole. Ms. Baccus stated that in her opinion, this is not 4.0. Ms. Hernandez stated that section 7.5 should apply to this situation. Ms. Baccus questioned if both members should equally share in the cost of PTD. The consensus is that the cost is equally shared, and sections 7.11 and 7.5 should be applied.

Ms. Baccus than questioned an SCE JPA with the pole type stating TSP. She added that the office is unfamiliar with the term. Mr. Chow responded that the term is for “Tubular Steel Pole”, and stands for engineered steel pole. He added that in the SCE system, engineered steel pole is denoted as TSP, however, in the Routine it is noted ES. He stated that this might create a problem for the SCE system. Ms. Baccus stated the issue is the date of the JPA, which is prior to establishing ES pole. Ms. Hernandez stated that ES poles are by special agreement.

Mr. Chow stated that he is aware of this JPA. He instructed Ms. Baccus return the JPA, and SCE would handle it.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m., and will meet on July 10, 2007.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

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

July 10, 2007

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 9:05 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Velma Prouty – AT&T California
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS (teleconference)
Mr. Justin Cashmer – Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Rick Freyre – City of LA (teleconference)
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Steve Rodriguez – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Ms. Kourtney Aboudara – NextG Networks
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by addressing the first issue on the agenda, **Item 1407: Proposed Revision to Section 4.1**. Mr. Chow stated that he would like input from the two major dissenting telecommunication members, Verizon California, and AT&T California.

Ms. Prouty stated that she did not have any additional input, and that her organization would not support the proposed SCE revisions to the section.

Mr. Chow stated that as a group, the ad hoc is in agreement that something should be implemented to deter this type action. However, arriving at an agreed solution has been problematic. Mr. Cashmer was unavailable to respond at the time.

Ms. Hernandez reiterated that SCE is of the opinion that the current penalty for this action is not sufficient to deter members from practicing this action. Mr. Chow added that this issue, internally, has a large impact, and is a great concern for SCE. Therefore, SCE would continue with this proposal.

After some discussion, it was agreed to table this issue for further discussion at the next ad hoc meeting.

The second issue on the agenda is **Item 1434: Non-Useable Space GO Rule 94.4-B&BC**. Ms. Hernandez stated that the clearance has been Board approved as common area, however; billing directives must be formulated.

Ms. Baccus suggested creating sub-section 2.7-I, titled, “Notation of Antennas on Poles”. It has also been suggested to create an example for Section 18, on how to notate an antenna, and the safety clearance area.

Ms. Thomas suggested creating a section for joint planning when placing a wireless antenna. She suggested creating Section 3.15 for this action. Section 3.15 would be titled, “Notice of Intention

to Place Wireless Antenna”. Ms. Hernandez stated that this action might require both section 3.15, and 4.0 as well.

Ms. Hernandez, and Ms. Thomas would be creating the verbiage for Section 3.15, Section 2.7-I, and the example for Section 18. It was agreed to place the new sections on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting, which will meet on July 18, 2007.

The third issue on the agenda is **Item 1436: Compliance with Routine Handbook/Training**. Ms. Corella read the correspondence she had previously sent to the committee legal, and also his legal response.

The members agreed that this item should be assigned to Reorganization as well. The Routine ad hoc would discuss a training package for those members who are unfamiliar and/or are having difficulty interpreting the handbook. The Reorganization ad hoc committee would discuss leverage for the committee, per the 1998 Agreement, for dealing with members who are incompliant. Some examples of incompliance are poles left in the field. Mr. Chow added that the compliance issue is also associated with unauthorized attachments, and the proposed revisions to Section 4.1.

Ms. Hernandez stated that she has a concern with **JPAs billing before other pending JPAs**. She added that this concern requires clarification, and could be a start for the training issues. She stated that when the iPAM application is launched, this should not be an issue, however; in the interim, she continues to see JPAs processed out of sequence. She added that a part of this problem is that members are not notifying other members that there is a pending JPA. She inquired as to how the members would ensure that all member staff would become aware of this training issue. She inquired how these training concerns would be conveyed to staff.

Ms. Haney responded that she relays all info to the proper parties within her organization. Ms. Prouty added that she too relays all pertinent information to those concerned within her organization.

Mr. Chow stated that this is handled similarly within his organization, with the exception that the information passes through many parties. He added that there is the risk of misinformation when so many parties are involved. He suggested documenting any training issues and/or ad hoc agreements, and placing the information on the web site.

The members discussed a new web page for those who handle JPAs to link to for any training concerns. It was suggested that the link would be on the home page, and would be titled, “JPA Alert”. The link would need to be very visible.

The consensus is to create the web link. Ms. Hernandez suggested that the first issue on the link should be JPA sequence. She added that it is necessary that a JPA processed prior to a pending JPA should note that XJPA should be finalized after pending JPA.

The members discussed the current methods each member utilizes when handling pending JPAs. The consensus is to upload the correct method for handling pending JPAs on the web site, and alert those who handle JPAs to visit the link.

The procedure for handling pending JPAs is as follows:

- Receiving member(s) of a preliminary JPA must research for pending JPA(s)
- If there is a pending JPA, make a copy of pending JPA, and attach to preliminary JPA and return to initiator
- Indicate on preliminary JPA billing sequence. (I.E. “Bill after preliminary JPAXXXX)

The members agreed that the issue of adding a **missing member(s) to the header JPA** should be addressed. The members created the process for this situation. The procedure for handling JPAs with missing members is as follows:

- Receiving member(s) discovers that an owner on record is missing from preliminary JPA, will return the JPA to initiator.

- Request that the initiator resubmit the JPA as a revised JPA reflecting the missing member (refer to Section 18.1-C (b)).

Ms. Haney raised a question in regards to training. She stated that her organization was sending out **JPA's for new poles without pole numbers**, due to the lack of a numbering system at that time. She added that Ms. Hernandez stated that pole numbers are not necessarily required on the preliminary JPA. However, Ms. Haney added that she has experienced JPAs returned from other members due to lack of pole number. She stated that she would like clarification on this situation, if a prelim JPA should, or should not be returned for lack of a pole number.

Ms. Prouty stated that historically, her organization would process prelim JPAs without new pole numbers, however; today her organization is able to provide pole numbers.

The members discussed this issue. It was suggested that if you do not have the pole number for a prelim JPA, then create a fictitious number, but ensure that the correct pole number is on the final JPA.

For the sake of newer, and incoming members, Ms. Hernandez stated that the issue of missing pole numbers should be clarified, and a standard set for all members. She added that members should not habitually omit pole numbers from prelim JPAs. All members should take effort in providing pole numbers on prelims.

Ms. Haney stated that there should be verbiage in the Routine to address the issue of missing pole numbers.

The members reviewed section 18.1-A for required information on a prelim JPA. It was agreed to add, "pole number(s)" to this section as the first item required. This minor verbiage revision would become effective immediately.

Ms. Haney opened discussion on **Sections 10.8, and 10.9**. She stated that her organization is experiencing difficulty gaining approval from other members in regards to the above-mentioned sections. This is creating a problem for her organization in that they are unable to move forward with construction. She suggested that perhaps a clock could start for this issue from the 45 days.

Mr. Chow stated that legally, only certified power personnel are allowed to transfer and/or rearrange power facilities. Therefore, approval must be given.

Ms. Prouty inquired as to how long should a joint member be required to wait for approval.

Mr. Chow responded that as business partners, members should communicate at the membership level, and then escalate the process within each member's respective organizations.

Ms. Haney stated that her organization would continue attempting to communicate with those members in question via telephone calls.

Mr. Chow distributed a copy of a Form 7 that he revised to address the SCE issue of wind loading. The members discussed the proposed revised **wind loading Form 7**.

Ms. Hernandez inquired if this is a Routine requirement from SCE. Mr. Chow responded that it is not a requirement, however, it is a method that would expedite processing the JPA by SCE having the ability to initially have the wind loading data.

After some review, Ms. Prescott stated that she does not support the proposal of the clock starting over due to wind loading. The members agreed that the clock should not re-start.

Ms. Prescott stated that if a member attaches the wind loading info to a JPA, the 45-day clock should be ample time. She added that her engineering is normally based on the 45-day clock.

The members asked Mr. Chow if SCE would notate the corrective action required by the submitting member on the Form 7.

He responded that he would notate this on the Form 7.

It is agreed that the SCE wind loading requirements would be placed on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting.

Ms. Baccus raised a question in regards to AC cost Item 14 Failure to Final, and Section 18.1-F. She stated that the Routine does not specify which year should be billed for this cost. She questioned if it should be a) the current year, b) year Form 48 sent by processing member, or c) year of the costs associated with the JPA. She added that the billing staff needs specific directions for which year, and cost to bill.

After some discussion among the members, it was agreed that the current year's cost should be billed.

Lastly, Ms. Baccus inquired if one member fully inspects a pole, and another member merely does a visual, should both visual inspections be shared, or should one member reimburse the second member. Ms. Baccus gave an example of where DWP is requesting a refund for a visual, since they did a full inspection.

Mr. Chow responded that SCE is mandated to inspect all poles they are attached, whether they are the base owner or not. Ms. Baccus stated that DWP is also mandated to inspect their base poles.

Mr. Chow stated that DWP, and SCE are currently in negotiation meetings for discussion on the inspection issues. When DWP and SCE iron out their issues, this should no longer be a problem.

Ms. Prescott stated that if the JPA has been approved, then the committee staff should not question it, and move forward with billing. If there is any question from any member on the JPA, then they should take care of their concern(s) with a correction of record.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m., and will meet on August 7, 2007.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

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

August 7, 2007

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 9:10 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Velma Prouty – AT&T California
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Cingular Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Ennis – Cingular Wireless
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Robert Allen – City of LA (teleconference)
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Ms. Kourtney Aboudara – NextG Networks
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by addressing the first issue on the agenda, **Item 1407: Proposed Revision to Section 4.1**. Ms. Hernandez stated that the ad hoc is waiting for any input from Verizon California, who was not in attendance. Mr. Chow stated that AT&T California, and Verizon California both do not support the proposal, and feel that this section should remain as it is currently written. Ms. Hernandez inquired if any ad hoc members have any suggestions for a compromise. Mr. Chow stated that it appears that the two dissenting members are firm in their stance, therefore, he proposed bringing this item to a vote at the next Board meeting. This item will be on the consent calendar of the next Board meeting.

The second issue on the agenda is **Item 1436: Compliance with Routine Handbook/Training**. Ms. Hernandez reported that the “JPA Alert” on the SCJPC.net web site is up, and ready for viewing. She added that Ms. Pranata has uploaded the information in reference to wireless antennas safety zone, and all other discussed issues. Ms. Hernandez inquired if any members had any issues pertaining to this item number.

Ms. Haney reported that she has questions, and concerns pertaining to revised JPAs. She stated that in the early stages of NextG, there were many errors in their JPAs. She added that her organization is attempting to finalize their JPAs with the necessary corrections. She stated that one JPA had 15 Form 7’s. Some members signed off the Form 7’s, while other members, AT&T California, and SCE especially, notified NextG that the JPAs should be revised. She stated that perhaps there should be guidelines in the Routine Handbook when a revised JPA is required. She added that the quality of work within NextG is improving, however, she added that new members might have similar issues when initially processing Form 2 preliminaries.

Ms. Hernandez stated that personally, this situation is not an ordinary one, and that eventually this problem would be eliminated. She added that in the process of returning JPAs, the outcome is that the initiators are receiving training from fellow members. Therefore, this situation need not be in the Routine, but the issue is that a better training method is required. She stated that it is not the full purpose of the Routine Handbook, or this ad hoc to train on processing preliminary JPAs.

Ms. Haney stated that the contractors greatly appreciate the corrections by other members, which has aided them in the learning process.

Ms. Hernandez stated that with Ms. Haney centralizing the processing location for NextG, has resulted in an improved JPA process by NextG.

Ms. Prouty stated that there is no example of a revised JPA in the Routine Handbook, thus giving no direction when a JPA should be revised.

Ms. Hernandez responded that in her opinion, this is a training issue, and a JPA processor should be aware of when a JPA should be revised.

Ms. Prouty agreed, and stated that according to her recollection, the Form 7 was a multi-page form. Ms. Corella stated that she would attempt to locate a Form 7 copy with multiple pages, or would inquire with Ms. Baccus.

Ms. Haney stated that what NextG is seeking is direction on JPAs with multiple corrections. Does NextG have to retroactively revise all multiple corrected JPAs? She added these JPAs have been built. She reiterated that she would like direction. She stated that some members have approved the Form 7, while other members have denied it. By revising the JPA those members that approved the JPA, now have a revised JPA that creates re-work for those members to whom within their organization, the JPA has been completed.

Ms. Prouty suggested coordinating a conference call with all members involved with the JPA to arrive at an agreement.

Mr. Chow stated that the scope of the NextG projects would entail more than three members. Therefore, in his opinion, the ad hoc should arrive at a method of handling this type situation. Ms. Haney stated that Mr. Chow suggested taking the Form 2, make changes and send the form with a Form 7. Mr. Hernandez responded that in her opinion this is not the correct method. Mr. Chow responded that with the method of processing JPAs within his organization, the aforementioned method is ideal for SCE.

Ms. Prouty stated that a conference call should be handled for this type JPAs. Ms. Haney responded that there are approximately 50 JPAs with this situation, and they are already built.

Ms. Hernandez stated that this is another issue if the JPA is already built and denied.

The members agreed that the Form 7 should have multiple pages. If the JPA is already built, than sending the Form 2 with the Form 7 should be applied.

Ms. Prouty stated that she would work directly with Ms. Haney on resolving these issues.

Mr. Chow stated that the ad hoc must arrive at a consensus on what direction NextG should take in handling this type JPAs. He suggested using the second page of a Form 2, as a second page for a Form 7.

Ms. Haney stated that she is carefully checking the work the NextG contractors are performing. She asked the ad hoc members to report to her of any repeat problems so she could attempt to correct the contractors.

Ms. Hernandez stated that any as built JPAs should not be revised since the Form 48 would be completed.

Mr. Chow stated that his organization is receiving the JPAs with the Form 48 attached. He added that what is needed is a format in order to allow all organizations to efficiently process this type JPAs.

Ms. Haney apologized to the members for the poor quality JPAs that NextG has been processing, however, she added that the members should start witnessing a better quality of work moving forward.

The consensus is to create a revised JPA, however, the date should not be changed since the project is built, send the Form 7 incorporated to the JPA, along with the Form 48. Attach a cover letter stating per the Routine Revision meeting dated August 7, 2007. She added that this is an exception for handling the NextG JPAs, and not to be used moving forward.

Ms. Haney responded that this is merely one area of a multiple area project. Therefore, she added that these type JPA errors would probably be discovered as they start looking at the JPAs from the remaining different areas.

The members stated that they would handle these as built JPAs as stated earlier, and this is a special circumstance, however, any concurrent projects should be expected to show improvement.

The members discussed creating an example of a revised JPA for section 18, and notating what it entails. **Item 1443: Section 18.1-C (b)** has been assigned to this ad hoc to address the issue of a revised JPA example.

Ms. Prouty raised an issue with the examples in Section 18. She stated that in some example headings, it states what the example is displaying, while others merely quote the example number. She added that there should be consistency in the example titles. She stated that some examples do not notate the associated authorized costs item number.

Ms. Hernandez stated that the ad hoc would re-visit this section for corrections for the sake of consistency.

The next topic of discussion is **wind loading**. Mr. Chow stated that the minimum required by SCE is the communications information. Acceptable is the printout from the different software programs utilized by various members. He added that the JPA is sent to the SCE distribution planner who performs calculations to determine if the pole is able to handle to additional attachment. The primary minimum info needed is communication comps, span length, type of equipment, and height of attachment. If SCE does not receive the required info, a Form 7 would be sent notating that the JPA would be approved when the following info is received by SCE.

Mr. Chow reiterated that this is not to become a part of the Routine, but merely a standing request by SCE to aid in expediting the process of this type JPAs.

Mr. Chow stated that a mechanism is required to allow changing of the date sent if required info is not received in a timely manner.

Ms. Hernandez responded that the 45 days apply if there is no response and/or communication from other members, however, if there is communication the 45 days do not apply and members may request additional time. The communication between members may continue for months before an agreement is reached.

Mr. Chow stated that the Routine was written to lend itself to the method business was transacted between members thirty or so years ago. In his opinion, it does not fit in today's world of joint pole transactions, especially the wireless organizations.

The members briefly discussed changing the time frame. They discussed the issue of the lack of members communicating with one another via a telephone call. Mr. Cox stated that it is difficult to have a call returned, and in many instances he must call repeatedly. The members agreed that direct communication would resolve many JPA issues.

The last issue discussed is a question from Ms. Baccus in reference to wireless antennas clearance zone. The question is how are poles handled that have an existing antenna and a third/fourth member desires to attach. The members discussed different scenarios. It was agreed to add verbiage to Section 3.15 or add Section 3.16 to address this issue.

In answer to the question, the members stated all info would be notated on the JPA.

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m., and will meet on September 11, 2007.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

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

September 11, 2007

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 9:25 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Velma Prouty – AT&T California
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS (teleconference)
Mr. Justin Cashmer – Verizon California
Mr. Daniel Riggs – Verizon California
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Steve Rodriguez – T-Mobile USA
Mr. Robert Allen – City of LA (teleconference)
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Mr. Wayne Brown – Southern California Edison
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Ms. Kourtney Aboudara – NextG Networks
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by addressing the first issue on the agenda, **Item 1436: Compliance with Routine Handbook/Training**. The members discussed the “JPA Alert” icon on the SCJPC web page. Mr. Brown suggested that the icon only flash when it has been recently updated. Ms. Prouty suggested a color representing the time frame the alert has been up. Ms. Prescott suggested leaving the alerts up for thirty days, and then transferring them to an archive file. The archive file should be accessible to the members should they choose to view prior alerts. Ms. Haney suggested adding the date of the latest update to the flashing icon. Ms. Pranata responded that she could add to the flashing icon, “Last update mo/date/year”. Ms. Thomas stated that in her opinion, she would prefer the icon flash continuously, because it does catch one’s attention. Mr. Chow stated there should be notation on the web page that the alerts would remain up for thirty days, and then archived.

It was agreed that added to the continuous flashing icon the date notated of the most recent update. Also, an explanation on the page stating the alerts are archived after thirty days, with a link to the archives.

Mr. Brown raised the issue of signatures on JPAs. He reported that SCE adheres to the policy of signatures/initials on JPAs, however, not all members adhere to this policy. He added that on multiple party JPAs, with a missing signature, SCE revises the JPA and returns a copy to all parties involved. He added that JPAs initiated by other members, and are revised, are not sending revised copies to SCE. Therefore, SCE is not aware if there is a problem or questions with the JPA. Mr. Brown stated that it is the responsibility of the initiator to inform multiple members when another party on the JPA has revised a JPA.

Ms. Haney stated that she has been training, working with, and making her group aware of these problems and issues. She added that she also has experienced this, and it appears that members are becoming lax in regards to signatures.

Ms. Hernandez stated that an unsigned JPA is not a valid approved JPA, and if she received such a JPA she would return it to the initiator. Ms. Prouty stated that such a JPA could be an advanced copy. Ms. Hernandez added that she would retain a copy of such a JPA, but would return it stating that it is not a valid JPA until signed, and request that the initiator change the date upon returning it. Ms. Hernandez suggested that this issue of missing signatures and missing sent dates on JPAs renders the JPA invalid should be uploaded on the web page.

Mr. Chow stated that historically his organization would process JPAs lacking initials, however, this has proved problematic.

The members discussed missing signatures and sent dates on Form 7's. Ms. Hernandez stated that the issue of missing signatures and sent dates on JPAs, and Form 7s requires further discussion, and training. She inquired how should these issues be stated on the alert page. Ms. Hernandez clarified that the date discussed is the date sent, not the date prepared. The ad hoc agreed that all members are lax in following proper procedures.

It was agreed that the initiator would determine the date sent, and notify all joint members via a Form 7, and not to neglect to initial the Form 7 for validity.

Mr. Brown stated that in some instances they receive a Form 48 prior to receiving the JPA. Ms. Hernandez inquired if the JPA had been sent to the JPC office. Mr. Brown responded that it had. Ms. Hernandez stated that this error should have been alerted at the JPC office. Mr. Brown shared an example of the JPA with this situation.

Mr. Brown stated that they are receiving 18.1 JPAs from the Owens valley. He added that he is unaware of a JPA until his office receives the final. Ms. Hernandez informed the members that if a member receives a final, and the JPC office has not closed and balanced the current month, the member may request the JPA pulled from the current month's billing.

Ms. Thomas stated that many instances it takes a lengthy period before Form 7s are received via USPS. She suggested members revert to telephone calls or email for better communication, and follow up with a hard copy Form 7.

The message on the alert page would refer to section 18.1 that specifies signature and/or initials, and section 18.1-A for the date sent. The alert for date sent is as follows: "If JPA is received without date, the receiving member is to notify the initiator. The initiator would notify all members on JPA by issuing a Form 7 to add the date to the JPA." In reference to missing signatures, it is to be noted that JPAs missing signatures and/or initials are invalid, and to please refer to Sections 18.1, and 18.1-A. There also must be reference to signatures and dates on Form 7s.

The second item on the agenda is the creation of **Item 1443: Section 18.1-C example and related verbiage**. Ms. Hernandez reported that she did not have the example prepared at this time, however, would have it prepared by the next ad hoc meeting.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1444: Foreign Attachments**. Ms. Hernandez inquired if this pertained to identification of foreign attachments. Mr. Allen stated that this issue refers to cameras, and all other technical equipment that the municipalities have been requested by outside agencies to allow them to attach this type equipment on poles. He added that he has heard of Y-FI on poles in the city. Mr. Allen inquired if any members have been approached with this type request. Mr. Chow responded that SCE has been approached, and has filed an advice letter to the commission, and the letter has been approved. This has resulted in a tariff for Y-FI attachment and electrical usage. They are creating a group to handle this action. The advice letter and the tariffs pertain only to SCE streetlight structures. If the Y-FI carriers choose to attach to wood distribution and transmission poles, it would be via the SCE standard license lease agreement.

Under miscellaneous items **Section 14.9 – AC 9** were discussed. This issue was brought to the table by AT&T California. Ms. Prouty stated that she is requesting interpretation and clarification of this section and the authorized cost. She added that some members are utilizing AC 9 with this section, when it should be AC 19 a, b, or c. She further stated that 14.9 stated that AC 9 does not apply to poles set in rear property. Mr. Brown stated that in some instances hand dig is utilized in rear property because of the inaccessibility of heavy equipment.

Mr. Chow stated that AC 19 is in conjunction with Section 7.4. AC 9 may be used with section 7.11.

Ms. Haney stated that when these costs were created there were a certain percentage of poles on property lines with piping or some other obstruction, not necessarily rear property.

Mr. Chow stated that hand dig might be applied in many instances, if the only option is to hand dig.

Ms. Prouty stated that some sections already have accounted for the hand digging, and the cost is included in the authorized cost. Ms. Prouty quoted verbiage from section 14.9, “Hand dig charges do not apply for poles set in same hole, or pole set in rear property”. She added that she is receiving JPAs with AC 9 where poles have been set in rear property.

Mr. Chow stated that you might utilize section 7.11 and apply AC 9. Mr. Cox stated that hand dig has been considered for sections with property line or in the street. Mr. Chow inquired when is hand dig applied. Ms. Prouty stated that there are sections where hand dig has been taken into account. However, there are some sections where hand dig has not been accounted for and AC 9 is applied. She added the objective is to determine those sections when AC 9 applies; however, rear property is not one.

Mr. Chow stated that if some section costs have accounted for hand dig, then AC 9 is not necessary.

Ms. Haney stated one situation might be on the street where there is an exception, and/or special circumstances. You are unable to use an auger, and hand dig is required. The section covering this type pole set did not initially take into account the need of hand dig.

Mr. Chow reiterated the need for AC 9 if hand dig is factored into pole costs. Ms. Haney responded that it is factored into situations requiring hand dig a majority of the time, such as rear property.

It was agreed to clarify when AC 9 applies.

The members discussed changing the verbiage from rear property/property line to accessible to equipment or inaccessible to equipment.

Mr. Chow stated for clarification, AC 9 should only be used in situations where you have access to the location with equipment, but you are unable to use equipment and must hand dig due to field conditions.

It was agreed that Mr. Chow and Mr. Cox would revise the verbiage for Section 14.9, and AC 9 for the next ad hoc meeting.

The next issue on miscellaneous items is the interpretation of Section 4.1. Mr. Chow opened discussion by stating that the last sentence in the first paragraph of this section states exactly what SCE has been proposing. He then read the sentence, “Said member shall be required to purchase interest at structural value and pay an added 50% penalty as per date Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization is issued.” He added that Section 4.0 states, “The interest and price applying thereto shall be in accordance with routine and schedule of structural values or other Authorized Costs and date Joint Pole Authorization is issued, unless otherwise agreed”. He stated that in this situation you would take the current year structural schedule and find the cost according to the schedule. However, 4.1 implies the structural value is based on the date the JPA was written. Mr. Chow then requested Ms. Baccus state the method her staff bills section 4.1.

Ms. Baccus stated that the billers go to the pole price schedule of the date that the JPA was written, and find the year the pole was set and take that price.

Mr. Chow stated that section 4.0 alludes to taking the schedule of the years structural value that the JPA was written, however, 4.1 does not take into account to utilize the schedule, but to take the structural value of the pole of the date the JPA was written. If the JPA is written in 2006, the price of the pole for that year is utilized. The schedule is taking into account the depreciation, however, the structural value of a pole means that year the JPA was written. He added that if 4.0, and 4.1 are meant to allude to similar methods of pricing, than why isn't the verbiage identical. He stated that in his opinion the writers of these two sections, realized that there should be a difference in pricing between the two sections, and that the penalty for this infraction should be purchasing at the current year price that the unauthorized attachment was discovered.

The members responded that in their opinion the writers neglected to include the word schedule. Mr. Chow reiterated that if the pricing method was meant to be similar, then the verbiage should be identical.

Ms. Thomas stated that she is of the opinion that it was agreed by the Board members that the current prices would not be used for section 4.1. Mr. Chow corrected Ms. Thomas stating that the proposal did not gain approval; therefore, this section verbiage is to remain unchanged.

Ms. Hernandez stated that originally she did not support the proposal, however, today she is of the opinion that some members are blatantly disregarding the Routine.

It was agreed that this would not pertain to two missed poles, but it is for those members who build a line, and do not process their paperwork.

Mr. Chow stated that the choice to exercise section 4.1 is based on an individual, and what their circumstances are.

Ms. Prouty stated that in majority instances the situation is not 4.1, then it is up to the receiving member to prove to the initiator that it is not a 4.1, but a 4.0.

Mr. Chow stated that his organization would continue to process 4.1, however, he added that he was made aware of the situation of calling out a 4.1 when in fact it is a 4.0. He added that his organization has improved the process of identifying 4.1. He further stated that the result of the original proposal's passage or denial does not have an impact on the volume of 4.1's SCE would continue to process. This is an integral part of his organization's method of doing business, because if there is an illegal attachment in violation, and there is litigation involved, the responsible party is SCE.

Ms. Prouty stated that in her opinion what prompted this SCE proposal was a certain new member who did not follow, or was unaware of the JPA process.

Mr. Chow responded that this is not the driver that prompted SCE to propose the revision to Section 4.1. He added this might have been a coincidence, since the violators are not one member, but many members.

The members discussed different scenarios to remedy this situation of illegal attachment.

Mr. Chow stated that perhaps the ad hoc could research to what the original writers of this section intended.

Ms. Hernandez stated that when the ad hoc reviewed this section, the understanding was that 4.1 would continue to be billed as is.

Mr. Cashmer stated that after reading section 4.1, it appears that Mr. Chow is correct in his interpretation.

It was agreed to review the minutes when the entire Routine Handbook was reviewed by this ad hoc. This is to ascertain what the members discussed in reference to sections 4.0, and 4.1. Item **1446: Review of Sections 4.0, and 4.1** has been assigned to this ad hoc.

In the interim, this section would continue to be billed in the current method.

Ms. Baccus stated that she was recently questioned on the method of billing mod poles. She quoted section 2.7-D Pole Reinforcement Cost Sharing. She added that when this is billed the cost is shared equally, however, the section states proportionately per foot. She reported that previously the per-foot method was used, however, in 2002 the billing method was changed to equally. She inquired

if the equal method, or the per foot method is what the members choose as a billing directive for mod poles.

Mr. Chow stated that when the committee terminated per foot billing, the equal billing came into play. Mr. Chow inquired if there is a major difference between methods in costs. Ms. Baccus responded that the difference is that the common area is taken into account.

Ms. Hernandez stated that previously there were no items for mod/steel sleeve, and members would provide a cost for the JPC to bill. When the costs were added the JPC used the equal method.

Ms. Baccus stated that the verbiage in the billing directive should be revised. Ms. Baccus would be creating the revised verbiage for Section 2.7-D.

Mr. Chow stated that in regards to the steel sleeve (SCE term-Re Pole), he would like to make clarification that the approved verbiage revision, which is effective January 2008, that removal may be by any member, not necessarily the installer. He would like to add that the practice of other members removing steel sleeve(s) has been practiced in the past, and continues today.

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m., and will meet on October 9, 2007.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

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

October 9, 2007

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 9:10 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Velma Prouty – AT&T California
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS (teleconference)
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Rick Freyre – City of LA (teleconference)
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by addressing the first issue on the agenda, **Item 1436: Compliance with Routine Handbook/Training**. Ms. Hernandez inquired if any members had any issues with training, or any other concerns they would like published on the web site JPA Alert page. There were no concerns or issues stated by the members.

Ms. Hernandez reported that Ms. Pranata is now archiving alerts that are over 30 days old. Members may link to the archive page to view any past alerts. The date the alert page was last updated is now reflected on the web page.

The second item on the agenda is **Item 1443: Section 18.1-C example and related verbiage**. Ms. Hernandez reported that she and Ms. Thomas have created the example and verbiage for this section. The documents were distributed to the members for their review and discussion (see attachment 1).

After discussion it was agreed to change the word, “can” in section 4 to read, “to”. A notation in bold is added to read, “ NOTE: The example was changed from relinquish Section 5.1A and 5.1 B to replace pole Section 7.11 and add new pole”. The notation is to clarify the displayed JPA example. The ad hoc approved the verbiage and example, which would be added to the Routine Handbook.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1444: Foreign Attachments**. Ms. Hernandez stated that this is a DWP issue. Mr. Freyre reported that he did not have any input at this time. Ms. Hernandez reported that this concerns the attachment of Y-Fi, and cameras. Mr. Freyre stated that he would research this and have input at the next ad hoc meeting. This issue would be tabled for the next ad hoc

Issue number four on the agenda is **1446: Review of Sections 4.0, and 4.1**. Ms. Hernandez reported that this issue pertains to the current verbiage of these sections, and their interpretations, and original intent.

Mr. Chow reported that Ms. Hernandez has researched old minutes, and discovered this section discussed in minutes dated June 1940. He reported that section 4.1 was written differently, and definitely referred to the pole set price of the current year. However, he has not been able to locate where the verbiage was changed to what it is today. He added in his opinion, this might have occurred when the new 1998 Agreement was created. This item would remain open at this time.

Under miscellaneous items Ms. Prouty questioned that when an anchor is placed for a private party what section is noted on the JPA. The members questioned why would a private party request an anchor. Ms. Prouty stated that she is referring to a JPA received in her office. Mr. Brown stated that there are instances where a private driveway is involved.

The members reviewed section 12 of the Routine handbook, and discussed this issue. The members agreed that this described situation is unusual. Ms. Prouty stated she would bring a copy of the JPA in question for the members to review at the next ad hoc meeting.

Ms. Haney suggested that the old minutes that are currently on hard copy should be scanned and placed on disk for future reference. It was agreed that the JPC staff would scan old minutes on disk.

Under action items Mr. Chow and Mr. Cox did not revise the verbiage for Section 14.0 and AC 9. Mr. Chow stated that the purpose is to clarify that hand dig is strictly for hand dig only, and not for other instances such same pole set. It was agreed to carry this over to the next ad hoc.

Ms. Baccus revised verbiage for section 2.7-D/Pole reinforcement Cost Sharing (see attachment 2). The members reviewed the proposed revisions to this section. It was agreed that paragraph 2 requires rewriting, or deletion. The members further discussed the revisions, and decided that the section revisions required additional work. This item would be tabled for the next ad hoc meeting.

Ms. Hernandez reiterated the **action items** from this ad hoc meeting. Mr. Chow and Mr. Cox will review and revise the verbiage for Section 14.9 and AC 9 (hand dig). Mr. Chow will contact Mr. Cashmer to discuss the issue of mod pole removal. Ms. Prouty will provide a copy of the JPA with the purchase of anchor for a private party for the next ad hoc.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m., and will meet on November 13, 2007.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

ATTACHMENT 1

PRELIMINARY JOINT POLE AUTHORIZATION – REVISED

EXAMPLE 12

(Revised Example 5)

1. Use the same JPA number as the original JPA adding a suffix of **REV**, **R01**, or **R1** which indicates it is a Revised JPA
2. Date Prepared and Date Sent are current dates. (The 45-day timeframe starts over) Cannot use the dates shown on the original JPA.
3. The change(s) to the JPA are shown in the body of the JPA
4. Per Section 18.1-C(B) a Revised JPA can be used for the following:
 - Add owner(s)
 - Add pole(s)
 - Change from wood to alternative pole type (i.e. CF, LWS)

Revision of verbiage for Sec 2.7 D

ATTACHMENT 2

Revision of verbiage for Sec 2.7 D

Current:

D. Pole Reinforcement Cost Sharing

The costs for installing pole reinforcements shall be established by special agreement and shared proportionate to ownership, based up the price per foot concept:

1. Mod/Pole

Removal will be done by the Member installing the mod/pole at the scheduled cost of pulling, transporting and disposing.

2. Upon relinquishment, the installing Member shall be released from all other financial liabilities associated with ownership other than the cost of removal. A pole record will be maintained until the pole is removed.

Proposed:

D. Pole Reinforcement Cost Sharing

The costs for installing pole reinforcements shall be established as an Authorized Cost and shared equally.

1. Mod/Pole

The Member installing the mod/pole at the scheduled cost of pulling, transporting and disposing will do removal.

2. Upon relinquishment, the installing Member shall be released from all other financial liabilities associated with ownership other than the cost of removal. A pole record will be maintained until the pole is removed.

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

November 13, 2007

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 9:10 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Velma Prouty – AT&T California
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas – Sprint PCS
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Robert Allen – City of LA (teleconference)
Ms. Betty Tenorio – Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Cory Autrey – Sprint-Nextel
Mr. Steve Rodriguez – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Sherri Goetz – Southern California Edison
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by addressing the first issue on the agenda, **Item 1436: Compliance with Routine Handbook/Training**. Ms. Hernandez inquired if any members had a routine handbook issue or concern that they would like discussed, and/or placed on the JPA alert. The members had no issues at this time. This item is to remain open should members have any further concerns.

Ms. Hernandez reported that there is a new JPA alert dated October 23, 2007. She recommended that members routinely visit the web site to view the JPA Alert page.

The second issue on the agenda is **Item 1444: Foreign Attachments**. Ms. Hernandez reported that this issue primarily concerns the attachment of cameras on poles, and was brought to the table by the City of Los Angeles. The item is to remain open for further discussion.

Issue number three on the agenda is **1446: Review of Sections 4.0, and 4.1**. Ms. Hernandez stated that Southern California Edison brought this issue to the table. This item pertains to the interpretation of both sections. Ms. Hernandez briefed the members for the sake of those who have not followed this item. She stated that Edison proposed increasing the unauthorized penalty by purchasing at the current year's structural value rather than at the pole year set schedule. The purpose is to create a greater deterrent to unauthorized attachments. However, when the proposal was presented to the Board for approval, it did not pass approval. She stated that after the proposal was denied, Edison reviewed the verbiage in the above-mentioned sections. Edison stated that in their opinion, the intent for section 4.1, in regards to the verbiage, is referring to the cost for structural value of the current year.

Ms. Hernandez stated that the difference in section 4.0 verbiage is that the committee would bill at the scheduled pricing, which would include the 4% depreciation. Section 4.1 does not state scheduled pricing, but states structural value.

Mr. Autrey inquired as to what the next action would entail, in order to resolve this issue. Ms. Hernandez responded that Edison is in the process of researching past minutes to aid in interpretation and original intent.

Ms. Corella reported the opinion of Verizon California is, regardless of the interpretation, a precedent has been set and the committee has been processing unauthorized attachment utilizing the current method, and should continue to do so, therefore would not support any change of interpretation or process.

The consensus is that this item should remain open for further discussion.

The next issue for discussion is **Item 1448: PTX**. Ms. Hernandez reported that Mr. George, of City of Glendale, brought this issue to the table. Ms. Hernandez stated that her interpretation of how a PTX should be notated on a JPA is different than the majority of the members. Therefore, she added that she would like to open discussion on this issue. She stated that in her opinion, the agreement was that a PTX would be reflected on the JPA, such as a 40 foot pole with a 10 foot PTX, the pole would be reflected as 40 foot, and the PTX reflecting where the power utility's attachment is on the PTX above the top grade. She added that by identifying the power attachment on the PTX, this would make the safety clearance requirement work. She further stated that if you have a 40-foot pole with a 10 foot PTX, and power is attached at 50 (or at the top of the PTX), clearance is not going to work according to section 16 since there is not enough footage.

Ms. Thomas stated that in her opinion she has ever seen a PTX where power is not attached at the highest grade, this being the reason for placing a 10-foot PTX as opposed to a 5 or 8 foot PTX. However, she added that this might be old-fashioned rule of thumb, things might have changed since there is nothing stating that when you place a 10-foot PTX you must attach at the top.

Mr. Autrey questioned if a PTX is placed on a 40-foot pole is the billing merely based on the size of the pole. Ms. Baccus responded that Mr. Autrey is correct, and that currently the only reference noted on a pole record is the term, "PTX". She added that the size of the pole is not changed, and the grade and space is not reconfigured.

Mr. Cox inquired how a PTX would change safety clearance on a 40-foot pole. Ms. Hernandez responded that if wireless requires attaching an antenna, then power needs to move up so wireless has their two-foot clearance. Mr. Cox responded that attachment of a PTX is normally for the power benefit and not communications.

Ms. Thomas inquired of Mr. Cox what size PTX is more commonly utilized by Pasadena. Mr. Cox responded that the 7-foot PTX is the most common for Pasadena. Ms. Thomas stated that if a 7-foot PTX is placed on a 40-foot pole, the clearance is there and communications may go as high as 39 or highest grade.

Ms. Hernandez inquired if it is agreed to notate the size of the PTX on the JPA and record. Ms. Thomas responded she understood that it was agreed to note the size PTX. Ms. Hernandez further stated that if communications attaches at 39, and the height of the PTX is not stated, then the safety clearance would not work since communications is at top grade.

Ms. Prescott stated that it appears in this situation, power doesn't own any space on the pole.

Ms. Baccus interjected that power must have at least one foot to attach their PTX to the pole therefore space and grade would be 39-1.

Mr. Cox interjected that a PTX has a two-foot piece of steel to attach to the pole. Mr. Cox stated that he is not aware of any instances where power would come below communications.

Ms. Hernandez stated that there have been instances when pole replacement is not an option, and they have requested a PTX for fiber and power moves up.

Ms. Hernandez reiterated that the issue is if there is a PTX on a pole how is it reflected on a JPA and pole record. She added that her primary concern is how the grade and space is allocated and notated.

Ms. Prouty stated that in her opinion the PTX should not be included in regards to pole height. Ms. Hernandez disagreed stating that if power is attached on the PTX that would allow for the safety clearance.

Ms. Prouty responded that in her experience the PTX has never been considered in regards to safety clearance, space and grade.

The majority of the members agreed with Ms. Prouty. Ms. Hernandez responded that she was under the impression that the ad hoc had agreed to consider PTX in reference to safety clearance, space and grade.

Ms. Baccus stated that she was instructed that if there is a PTX the configuration of the safety clearance would not be per the handbook, and that power would be on the PTX therefore there is no concern about the safety clearance. She added that currently, the PTX size is not notated on the JPA, only the term "PTX".

Ms. Prouty stated that the members have discussed notating the PTX size on the JPA and record.

Ms. Prouty shared a JPA example with a PTX, which reflected where power and communications were attached and allocation of space and grade. This is a 30-foot pole with power at 25-2, and communications at 23-7.

Mr. Autrey stated that it appears that the primary purpose for a PTX is so that communications can attach at the top of the pole, therefore, you will never be able to allocate the safety clearance per the book, and will have to assume the safety clearance per the PTX.

The members agreed that there requires a clarification for the assumption of the safety clearance.

Ms. Hernandez stated that there should be notation identifying the clearance zone, which would leave no room for assumptions.

The members discussed several scenarios involving PTX and methods of billing.

In summation, it was agreed that the height of the PTX must be notated on the JPA and record, as well as the grade of attachment of power on the PTX. It was agreed that the height of the pole should not change. This method would be utilized moving forward and not retroactively. The members questioned the number of PTX instances. Ms. Baccus responded that there are some, however, the amount is not great.

The members discussed revising the verbiage for section 14.5 to include existing poles to where you are an owner on record. It was agreed to create a JPA example for section 18. Ms. Baccus stated that section 2 would require directives for billing as to how, and where to notate the PTX and power attachment on the pole record.

This item is to remain open for further discussion at next ad hoc meeting.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1449: Review Section 15.2-A** brought to the table by AT&T Wireless. Ms. Hernandez stated that in her opinion it is difficult to dictate to members color codes for marking their cable equipment. However, she added that she would like to convey to members to notify their respective construction people to ensure that they mark their communication cables. She added that when marking cable equipment, to please ensure that the identification name is legible and that the tags are not twisted and/or turned. It was agreed that this notification/request be posted on the JPA alert page.

Under miscellaneous the members discussed **section 14.9 hand dig**. Ms. Corella distributed a document submitted by SCE in reference to hand dig (see attachment 1). The members reviewed the document.

Ms. Hernandez briefed the members on the issue. She stated that hand dig is included in the pole prices; however, there are instances when hand dig is warranted when it is over and above what is included in the pole prices, and members should be compensated.

Ms. Prouty added that what brought this issue to the table is that some members are currently adding AC 9 to all property line pole sets. She stated that she would like to clarify to all members the understanding of when the hand dig costs apply.

Mr. Autrey stated that if hand digs are included in the pole prices, under some very difficult and some very simple situations, why would it require a separate cost since overall it balances.

Mr. Allen responded that if you are setting a pole on property line or street, and there is a gas line, you are unable to use an auger, therefore, you hand dig.

Mr. Autrey responded that wouldn't this be built into the pole prices, under some difficult situations that have been taken into consideration in the pole price elements.

Mr. Allen responded that his prices are for setting a pole with a truck in the street that would not include a hand dig, and his organization does not consider hand dig an average pole set.

Mr. Autrey questioned if Mr. Allen is not factoring an average of hand dig situations into his pole prices.

Mr. Allen responded that DWP does not consider hand dig as a part of their pole prices.

Ms. Hernandez interjected that in her opinion; difficult as well as ordinary pole set situations should be averaged into pole prices.

Mr. Allen reiterated that DWP pole prices are for normal pole sets with a truck. Anything above and beyond that is out of the ordinary and not included in their pole costs.

The majority of the ad hoc members agreed that if hand dig (under average difficult situations) is factored and included in the pole prices, then AC 9 and section 14.9 should be removed.

Mr. Allen responded that he is not in agreement.

Ms. Hernandez read from the September minutes and it states that the ad hoc must arrive at an agreement of when AC 9 is applicable.

The members reviewed and extensively discussed the definition of elements utilized when members calculate their pole costs.

Ms. Hernandez reiterated what prompted this concern. She stated that a clerical of SCE was including AC 9 on all pole replacement JPAs, when it might not have been warranted. She added that her organization would deny the JPA. Therefore, it must be determined when and if this cost is necessary. She reported that this issue prompted the field meet of September 28, 2001 (attachment 1).

Ms. Prouty reported that it appears that SCE is repeating this method of including AC 9 on a great majority of their pole set JPAs. Therefore, she added it is time to determine and clarify AC 9, and Section 14.9. She further stated that perhaps this cost is not necessary since any situation that proves difficult and costly could be handled via section 1.2.

Mr. Allen stated that he is under the opinion that the purpose of arriving at authorized costs is to move away from 1.2.

Ms. Hernandez responded that she is not certain that the committee attempted to move away from 1.2, however; she is aware that some members would like to eliminate 1.2. She added that in her opinion, she does not want to eliminate 1.2 because this would stop field meets, which in many instances are required.

It was agreed to assign a number to this issue. **Item 1450: Review of Section 14.9 Hand Dig** has been assigned to this ad hoc.

The next miscellaneous item is review of section 2.7-D pole reinforcement cost sharing. This issue concerns removal of mod poles. Ms. Goetz reported that according to her notes taken from the previous ad hoc meeting, the ad hoc is waiting for a response from Verizon California. It was agreed to keep this miscellaneous item open for the next ad hoc meeting.

Utility color code is next on the agenda. Ms. Hernandez instructed that this issue be removed from the agenda.

Lastly on miscellaneous items is wireless equipment removed by other than equipment owner. Ms. Hernandez reported that this was prompted in light of the recent fires; however, prior to this emergency there have been situations where some members have removed wireless equipment and have misplaced it.

Mr. Rodriguez reported that T-Mobile experienced a situation where their equipment was removed by SCE, and now they are unable to locate their equipment. He added there is an issue with the timeline in getting service restored. He further stated that it appears that there lacks a sense of urgency in coordinating a meeting. Mr. Rodriguez would like to correct this issue within this forum as to protocol when these situations arise, contact personnel from both sides. He added that he was not notified that his equipment was removed.

Mr. Allen inquired who was contacted at DWP in regards to this situation. Ms. Hernandez responded that the contact person was Mr. George Gonzalez, and her situation was in regards to an LAC site. She reported that a fielder noticed that their antennas had been removed from their site. Mr. Gonzalez ascertained that the antenna had been removed; however, he was not aware of the antennas location at that time. She added that this was not recent, but she stated that this type situation continues to occur. She stated that in her opinion this issue warrants discussion, and members must be courteous to one another and notify one another when their respective equipment has been removed. She added that equipment is costly.

Ms. Hernandez reiterated the extreme necessity to contact fellow members when their respective equipment has been removed, and inquire where to leave the wireless equipment so that the equipment owner may recover it. She reiterated that aside from the loss of service, there is the cost of the equipment.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that there are hidden unrecoverable costs in this type situation, costs that cannot be recouped through the JPA process.

Ms. Hernandez suggested creating an authorized cost for this situation, in order to recoup some costs.

Mr. Brown interjected that there is the timing involved to restore the site and the service. He added that wireless organizations should be aware of where on the list of priorities of power utilities are removal of wireless equipment in emergency situations.

Ms. Prouty stated that wireless members could utilize AC 199 in this situation. Mr. Brown added that there is the cost of down time to consider. Ms. Hernandez added that the planning process must be repeated as well.

Mr. Allen stated that companies couldn't dictate to other companies what their respective priorities are within their organizations.

Mr. Autrey inquired if this ad hoc committee could be the forum to address this issue by bringing to the table those individuals, within each respective organization, directly accountable for this wireless equipment restoration.

The consensus is that this issue should be addressed and required further discussion. **Item 1451: Wireless Equipment and Restoration of Service** has been assigned to this ad hoc committee.

Ms. Thomas suggested creating a section to address storm damage, fire damage and acts of nature. This would make this type JPAs priority to all other JPA transactions. It was agreed to assign **Item 1452: New Section for Disaster Replacement** to this ad hoc.

Lastly, Ms. Thomas raised the question of the ability to deny a fellow member an extension to the 45-day period, and what are the ramifications, if any. She also questioned if there is a limit on extension requests. Ms. Thomas stated that there are instances when she has received extension requests after the period has expired. She inquired if a fellow member requests an extension, and her

organization denies the request, what are the ramifications? Mr. Autrey responded that members should work with one another, and at a minimum, grant one extension.

Ms. Thomas reiterated her concern that if she denies extension, and starts construction what are the ramifications for members involved.

The members discussed this issue extensively, and it was agreed to assign **Item 1435: Extension of 45 Day Period** to this ad hoc.

Ms. Hernandez stated the **action items** from this ad hoc meeting. In regards to Item 1448: PTX, members to work on revisions for section 14.5 to include existing poles if you are an owner on record. Work on billing directives for section 2 as to how and where to notate PTX height and power attachment on pole records. Create a JPA PTX example for section 18.

Verizon California must respond to the mod pole question in regards to section 2.7-d reinforcement cost sharing.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m., and will meet on January 2008.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

ATTACHMENT 1

**9. Hand Dig Pole
Set.....**

618

14.9 Hand Dig Pole

The cost for hand digging a pole replacement, or new set will be shared equally among all pole owners. Hand dig charges do not apply for poles set in same hole, or poles set in rear property. **Hand dig applies in cases where excavation is accomplished via hand digging in lieu of equipment.**

If after the fact a hand dig charge is warranted, the charge may be added via Form 48 and/or Form 7. USA marking within 3' of the pole would indicate that the hand dig charge was applicable.

(See Item 9 of Authorized Costs).
[Section 14.9 Clarification](#)

SECTION 14.9 CLARIFICATION – HAND DIG POLE

September 28, 2001

Field Meet with Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Southern California Edison, and Pacific Bell regarding hand dig charges (Item 9).

In Attendance:

Chris Bengtsson, LADWP
Dennis Walls, LADWP
Ernie Solorzano, SCE
Adolph Gonzales, SCE
Lupe Hernandez, Pacific Bell
Jim Sanderson, Pacific Bell
Rod Wheeler, Pacific Bell
Ken Vail, Pacific Bell

It was discussed:

- ❖ 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 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.

These would be brought up to the Administrative Board of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee for discussion.

19. Cost for placing pole back in the same hole:

(a)	Pole placement located on street without riser and/or equipment	
(b)	Pole placement located on street with riser and/or equipment.....	
(c)	Pole placement on rear property with or without riser and/or equipment	
		1063
		1233
		1547