

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

January 12, 2010

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 10:55 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon California
Mr. Steve Rodriguez – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Serv/AT&T Comm
Ms. Alicia Smith – AT&T Local Serv/AT&T Comm.
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by addressing the first item on the agenda, **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. She stated that this item pertains to lists of outstanding JPAs being sent to initiating parties. She added that she is receiving lists, which means that the process is working. This item is a standing agenda item.

The second issue on the agenda is **Compliance with Routine Handbook**. Verbiage for a 2-step process has been created for resolution with non-compliant members. It was agreed to hold this issue open until the pole inspections/safety hazards reporting method is determined. This item is to remain open at this time.

The third issue on the agenda is **Item 1343: Section 4.1 Review of Process and Interpretation**. Ms. Hernandez stated that there are historical minutes referring to this issue that have been compiled for review by the members.

Mr. Chow stated that this item and Item 1446 intertwine and could be combined.

Ms. Hernandez responded that section 4.0 addresses purchasing issues such as reserving space but not attaching at a specific time, but finalizing the paperwork so others could move forward. It was agreed that these two items remain separate.

Mr. Chow returned to the current agenda item. He questioned a scenario where a JPA has been initiated four to five years earlier, the work is complete, and still the JPA has not been finalized. He inquired at what point in time does a purchase of interest really become a purchase of interest. He added that in the four to five years, the pole has experienced a great amount of activity, at what point in time does the purchasing member become liable to share in the cost of transactions and/or benefits associated to the pole.

Mr. Chow stated that the proposed penalty for unauthorized attachment is purchase at year set of pole, and the penalty fee is 50% of the CURRENT purchase price of the pole.

Mr. Wolfe proposed rather than notifying the initiating party via a Form 7 that you intend to finalize their JPA if they do not, notify them that you are canceling their JPA, and this results in their being attached without authorization.

Mr. Chow responded that the afore-mentioned proposal is a good approach. However, what normally occurs is that a Form 7 cancellation notification is sent, the response is that the joint member would finalize the JPA, and what transpires is another four to five years of elapsed time. He concluded if all members followed the Routine, this would not be an issue.

The members discussed section 11-Free Attachments – service drops. Mr. Chow stated that historically, it is the option of the entity that discovers the service drop to determine if it is section 4.0 or section 4.1. Ms. Hernandez stated that if the situation does not meet the description and fit the criteria for a free service drop described in section 11, than the entity needs to purchase.

The discussion moved on to the proposal of a 2-tier penalty fee.

Ms. Walls gave a scenario where a new member illegally attaches and states that they intend on processing their JPA at a later date, versus M having a pole and H is requiring a service drop to a house and forgets to process a JPA. He questioned if the penalty should be the same in both situations? He stated that in his opinion there should be two tiers based on the length of membership.

Mr. Chow stated that the issue is for many situations not necessarily service drops only. He added that Mr. Wolfe stated that if the unauthorized is for a service drop, the service drop penalty should be the old method of penalty. Thus resulting in two tiers. He added that E would write a service drop as a 4.0.

In summation, Ms. Hernandez stated that it appears M and H is not in support of the penalty of 50% of the current pole cost. She added that this could result in a two-tier penalty. She further added that this would require the ad hoc to document the criteria for the two tiers. She stated she heard some criteria mentioned such as new members versus members with a specific length of membership, and service drops versus hard attachments. The ad hoc would require agreeing if they would propose a two-tier penalty and if so the specific criteria.

Ms. Hernandez stated that the ad hoc must specifically define unauthorized attachment, different scenarios and criteria for the two-tiers.

Mr. Wolfe stated that he had previously created verbiage for the two-tier method. The ad hoc would review the proposals created by Mr. Wolfe.

Next on the agenda is Item **1446: Section 4.0 Review and Interpretation**. This issue was brought to the table by SCE. After extensive discussion it was agreed that SCE and AT&T Local Services would work on an outline for section 4.0 final billing.

The fifth issue on the agenda is **Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement**. This pertains to a second meeting to address the issue that SCE does not allow other members to replace poles. A meeting has transpired, and a second meeting is to be scheduled. From the first meeting, members had concerns. Their concerns were documented and sent to Bob Patterson of SCE.

Mr. Eastwood stated that this concern continues to be discussed within SCE.

Mr. Chow was informed that Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Autrey sent their concerns to Mr. Bob Patterson. Mr. Chow stated that he would follow up with Mr. Patterson.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1494: PTD of Composite Poles**. This issue was brought to the table by AT&T California.

Mr. Wolfe stated that he strongly believes that the member that sets this type pole should be the member to PTD the pole. In example, the setting party should remove steel poles that are normally set with cranes, since communication members are ill equipped to remove this type pole. He added that this topic is in need of discussion.

Mr. Walls stated that he agrees with Mr. Wolfe in that the setting party should be the entity to remove it.

Mr. Chow stated that he would contact the correct party within his organization to acquire information on removing this type pole.

Item 1495: Pole Inspections is next on the agenda. The ad hoc is to discuss a possible section to address new ruling on GO 165-CPUC fire ordinance. Ms. Wolfe reported that the commission is on phase two. This item is to remain open.

The last assigned issue to the agenda is **Item 1496: Inaccessible Pole Removal**. This issue was brought to the table by AT&T California. Mr. Wolfe stated that there are additional costs associated with this difficult pole removal.

Ms. Hernandez stated that it does not necessarily require a section to be added to the Routine Handbook. What is required is to create an authorized cost.

It was agreed to move this issue to the authorized ad hoc committee for discussion.

On miscellaneous items Ms. Hernandez opened discussion on the **clarification of free service and free attachments** – differences and need for grade and space of attachment on JPC pole records and finals. This concern was brought to the table by JPC office supervisor, Ms. Baccus.

The members discussed their interpretation of free attachment versus free service. Mr. Chow stated that if this is a node site pole with a secondary to feed service to a building, in his opinion, there is no need to capture this information in the JPC database.

Ms. Hernandez stated that the ad hoc would need example JPAs to clarify this issue for Ms. Baccus. The ad hoc would further discuss this issue with the aid of examples.

It was agreed to assign an item number to this issue. **Item 1497: Standardization of Free Attachments**.

Ms. Hernandez then opened discussion on **Section 18.1B (3)-Multi-Party JPAs**. Her concern is the process of notifying all members of changes to a JPA. She stated that multi-party JPAs have many members. She added that it is her understanding that she initiates and sends a JPA to joint member's, then a member makes changes to the JPA, it is the initiator that then sends a copy of the changed JPA to all other members on that JPA so they become aware of the changes. This ensures that when all parties receive the final, they are aware of all changes. She further added that what she is experiencing is that she is not receiving any JPAs with the changes, or she is receives a Form 7 with all members changes noted on the Form 7. She does not support the Form 7 method of notification on changes to multi-party

JPA's; she prefers a marked up/changed JPA. She added that the section states that it is the responsibility of the initiating member to notify all other member's party to the JPA; however, it does not direct the method of notification. She inquired of the members which method is preferable, a Form 7 or a marked up/changed JPA.

The members discussed the two methods and their preference. Rather than make any revisions to the Routine Handbook, the consensus is to create a JPA Alert for the SCJPC.net web page (see attachment).

Review of action items:

- SCE (Larry Chow) and AT&T Local Services (Lupe Hernandez/Alicia Smith) to provide an outline for final bill Section 4.0.
- Locate and review two-tier proposal for Item 1343.
- SCE to research composite fiberglass removal method and costs.
- Item 1496 to be assigned to authorized costs ad hoc committee
- SCE to look into scheduling a second meeting for Item 1472-Pole Replacement Requirement
- DWP to forward information on iron poles to members

The meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m. until February 2010.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

Attachment

JPA ALERT

Acceptable method of notifying involved members as described in Section 18.1-B (3) includes sending Form 7 indicating “See changes” with copies of marked-up Form 2 Preliminary JPAs as attachment.

Involved member means changes affecting that member

Section 18.1-B(3) Multi-Party JPAs

An acceptable method for the initiating member to notify all involved parties of any changes made to a JPA includes sending a Form 7 indicating “See Changes” with a copy of the marked-up Form 2 Preliminary JPAs as an attachment.

Note: Copies of the changed JPA may be sent to **ONLY** the affected members. .

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

February 9, 2010

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 12:40 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles
Mr. Cory Autrey – Sprint/Nextel
Mr. Steve Rodriguez – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Serv/AT&T Comm
Mr. Jeff Wolf – AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by stating that the agenda items would be prioritized as to need for discussion due to time constraints. The first issue addressed is the third item on the agenda, **Item 1343: Section 4.1 Review of Process and Interpretation**. She stated that she did not review the 2-tier proposal provided by AT&T California. She inquired if the members preferred to hold this over for the next ad hoc meeting. The consensus is to table this item at this time.

The next issue addressed is **Item 1446: Section 4.0 review and interpretation**. Ms. Hernandez reported that she was unavailable to meet with Mr. Chow in regards to this issue. Mr. Chow stated that he created an outline including some general ideas. He added that he would enhance the outline and forward it to Ms. Hernandez. He added that he would be proposing for section 4.0, that after the JPA has been reviewed and approved and there are poles that require special attention, that they should be removed from the JPA and addressed separately. This would leave a JPA where the purchasing party is able to move forward. After the 45-day period has elapsed, a member party to the JPA is able to finalize the JPA. He presented a scenario where a JPA has 10 SCE poles, and 10 VZ poles. SCE could finalize the JPA with the 10-SCE poles, and VZ, if they desire, could finalize the JPA with their respective poles. This process would create a change in how JPAS are processed in that the JPC office would require multiple finalization of one JPA. He added that this would create a radical shift in how JPAS are finalized. Mr. Chow would be sending Ms. Hernandez the necessary paperwork for her review.

The fifth issue on the agenda is **Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement**. This pertains to a second meeting to address the issue that SCE does not allow other members to replace poles. Ms. Hernandez inquired of Mr. Chow the status on the scheduling of another meeting.

He responded that he continues to concentrate on contacting the correct personnel to arrange a second meeting. This item is to remain open.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1494: PTD of Composite Poles**. The ad hoc committee agrees that the setting party should be the party to PTD this type poles. Mr. Chow stated that he was to bring information on the process of removing this type pole. He reported that the expert staff member on composite poles has retired from SCE. Currently, there is no one within SCE that is able to provide Mr. Chow with this information. However, he added that when speaking with other SCE staff, they have informed him that this type poles are disposed just as wood poles are disposed. He was informed that there is nothing different or unique about composite poles.

Mr. Wolfe stated that he envisions issues and problems for communications when removing composite fiberglass poles.

Mr. Chow responded that when a composite fiberglass expert could be contacted, he would inquire further into this issue.

It was agreed that this item number should remain open for further discussion.

Item 1495: Pole Inspections is next on the agenda. Mr. Autrey opened discussion by stating that a contact list should be created to report pole inspection infractions mandated by the CPUC, and suggested creating a list as Ms. Haney has created for NextG.

Ms. Haney responded that her list is internal to NextG, but suggested that it could be added to the member contact list on the SCJPC.net website. She added that if she does not have a contact person, NextG would send the information to the representative, although it would expedite things if the information were sent directly to the correct party.

Mr. Wolfe stated that members should provide their contact person, or expect to receive multiple calls in regards to CPUC hazard situations.

Mr. Chow reported that SCE would have a special unit handling this type calls and information.

Mr. Walls stated that DWP would also assign a special group to address these calls and concerns.

Mr. Chow stated that the issue of several members inspecting the same poles requires discussion. A process should be created where the member that inspects a pole for safety and fire hazard infractions, would share the costs with joint members. This would eliminate redundancy of fieldwork.

Ms. Hernandez inquired if any members would be opposed to disclosing reporting infraction contacts on the web site.

The consensus is to solicit members for their respective contact person when reporting noted General Order infractions resulting from pole inspections.

The next topic for discussion is **Item 1497: Standardization of Free Attachments**. The question is if FA (free attachment) and FS (free service) imply a similar situation. Ms. Baccus stated that JPAs are submitted with both FA and FS. Ms. Hernandez stated that they

are the same, and that the free attachment is for a service drop, and believes that the acronym derived from a combination of FREE attachment and SERVICE drop (FS). It was agreed to conform the free attachment and free service to be noted as FA. Ms. Baccus then questioned if with a free attachment, does the grade and space require notation on the pole record? After discussion it was agreed that the grade only would be noted on the pole record with FA.

Item 1498: LA County Permits Process/Fee was next on the agenda. Mr. Autrey stated that he believes the committee would determine how the members would share permit costs and create a process that would satisfy LA county.

Mr. Wolfe stated that he spoke with SCE and he is not receiving a response from them in a willingness to buy into the permit process.

Mr. Chow responded that the county has expressed to SCE that they are not concerned with the joint process or that the pole has multiple owners they want one entity to be responsible for the entire process and that entity is SCE.

Mr. Wolfe reported as he has in the past, that AT&T California is aggressively working on eliminating their backlog in regards to removing and disposing of poles left in the field.

Mr. Chow responded that this would aid in solving the issue with the county.

Mr. Wolfe stated that the county does not want AT&T California pulling their permits at the same time SCE does. He added that he is not aware when SCE would pull their permits.

Mr. Chow responded that this would double the work for the county. He stated that he feels a solution would be that SCE be the intake point for these issues and problems, and that when the county contacts SCE; SCE would then contact the other member(s) involved, and that the joint member(s) would ensure the issue be resolved immediately.

Mr. Wolfe responded that AT&T California now maintains a pole removal complaint group to address this issue.

It was agreed that this item remains open at this time.

Lastly, discussed are miscellaneous items. Mr. Chow opened discussion on the issue of noting pole class on the Form 7, and the Form 48. It was agreed that this is a good proposal. Ms. Hernandez suggested placing the class in the “stake box”, since this box is no longer utilized. Ms. Chow responded that he believes DWP continues to utilize this check box. It was agreed to contact DWP to determine if they are continuing to utilize the stake check box prior to determining where the pole class information would be noted.

The next topic for miscellaneous is the collection of cable tags to be available on the SCJPC.net website. Mr. Autrey stated that a notice was sent to members requesting that they submit a photo of their cable tags to be identified by other members. Ms. Corella reported that she has received some responses. The members viewed the submitted tag pictures.

The consensus is to send out another reminder to members requesting they submit a copy of their cable tag no later than March 1, 2010.

Ms. Baccus reported receiving a final Form 2 with a pole tag number CATV0132. She inquired if this is an acceptable pole tag prefix? Ms. Hernandez stated that at times poles are given numbers as a placeholder, and that the aforementioned number is not a valid pole number. This Form 2 should be returned requesting the correct pole number.

Review of action items:

- Ms. Corella to solicit from members a copy of their cable tags to be submitted no later than March 1, 2010.
- Ms. Pranata to upload a JPA Alert that with free attachments, grade must be noted on Form 2.
- Mr. Chow to send proposal for section 4.0 to ad hoc members.
- Mr. Chow to continue arranging a meeting with SCE and members to address SCE pole replacement requirement.
- Ms. Corella to solicit members for their CPUC pole inspection/safety contact personnel.
- Members to research PTD of composite fiberglass poles within their respective organizations, and report at the next ad hoc meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m. until March 9, 2010.

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 9, 2010

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 10:30 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Steve Rodriguez – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Serv/AT&T Comm
Ms. Alicia Smith – AT&T Local Serv/AT&T Comm.
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff
Mr. Kyle Levy – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by addressing the first issue on the agenda, **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. She stated that this issue pertains to status reports sent to fellow members from members who are researching outstanding foreign JPAs.

Mr. Wolfe commented that AT&T California is cognitive of the urgency of completing the work in a timely manner so that fellow members need not question the status of outstanding JPAs. Ms. Hernandez commented that this holds true for AT&T Local Services. There were no further comments on this issue.

The next issue addressed is **Compliance with Routine Handbook**. This is a standing agenda item. This item is on hold until the pole inspection/safety hazards reporting method is determined. This item is to remain open at this time.

The third topic of discussion is **Item 1343: Section 4.1 Review of Process and Interpretation**. Mr. Wolfe has created a proposal to address this issue. The members reviewed the 2-tier proposal.

Mr. Wolfe stated that the proposal is split into two categories. One is when the unauthorized member initiates the JPA, and the other is when the pole owner initiates the JPA. He is suggesting no changes for service drops, and soft line facilities. The proposal is when the pole owner initiates the JPA via 4.1, and it is a hard line facility, the penalty is

based on the current structural value of the pole set. The purchase would be based on the year the pole was set.

The second category is when the unauthorized attaching party initiates the JPA for service drop and soft line facilities, there should be no penalty and they should purchase under section 4.0. He further stated that on hard line facilities the penalty should be 50% of the structural value of the year the pole was set.

Mr. Chow commented that Mr. Wolfe's proposal appears in line with previous discussions on this issue. He added that in regards to a JPA initiated by the unauthorized member for a service drop, and that this should be a 4.0 and not 4.1 could create problems. He gave an example where H has initiated a 4.0 JPA for a service drop, and when E visits the site and notes the service drop, E would cross out the 4.0 and input a 4.1. This would require extensive training because he foresees a re-training problem since E has always billed in this fashion. All E personnel would need to become aware of this change in the Routine. He further added that he did not have a problem with a service drop being a 4.0 proposal. There remains the understanding for the billing staff on how to bill this 2-tier transaction.

After extensive discussion, it was agreed to have Ms. Baccus create a sample of pole owner initiated multi-party JPA for hard line facility using section 4.1 with the proposed billing versus the previous proposal. This item is to remain open for further discussion at the next ad hoc meeting.

Next issue for discussion is **Item 1446: Section 4.0 review and interpretation.** Ms. Hernandez reported that she and Mr. Chow were to outline final billing for section 4.0, however, was unable to communicate with Mr. Chow.

Mr. Chow reported that he has contemplated two methods for this billing. One is a fundamental change to how members are to operate, primarily those major pole owners. The method would be for purchases of interest only, that the selling party would be responsible for completing the final JPA. He added that the major communications members might be of the opinion that the purchasing party should continue to final the JPA. He added that it could continue as is where the purchasing party final bills the JPA, with the caveat that the selling party is to have the option of final billing the JPA, as any other member party to the JPA. Also, if the options that the receiving party is able to final bill the JPA that AC 14 Failure to Final JPA fee is applicable. He summated that these issues remain to be discussed, and would be included in the billing outline for Section 4.0. This item is to remain open for further discussion.

The fifth issue on the agenda is **Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement.** This pertains to a second meeting to transpire between the members and SCE. Mr. Chow reported that Mr. Eastwood is in the process of bringing this meeting to fruition.

Ms. Hernandez stated that the issue is not only E based poles, but there are situations where the pole is H based, and E is attached, and E does not allow other members to replace poles even in this type situation. She added that there are many questions and issues that require discussion including guy poles, between SCE and joint members. This item to remain open until a meeting to address these concerns transpires.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1494: PTD of Composite Poles.** Mr. Chow reported that in speaking with SCE personnel, they are in favor of the setting party being

responsible to PTD the pole. This issue would remain open at this time for further discussion.

Item 1495: Pole Inspections is next on the agenda. Mr. Rodriguez reported that SCE hosted a forum of JPC members, headed by Mr. Sam Stonerock. Mr. Eastwood reported that a result of the forum was identifying issues that require attention and those that do not need much attention. Mr. Rodriguez added that the bottom line is agreeing on what is expected of fellow members amongst themselves, and to avoid redundancy. This item is to remain open at this time.

Item 1498: LA County Permits Process/Fee was next on the agenda. Ms. Hernandez reported that Mr. Autrey requested this item to remain open, therefore would like to table this issue until Mr. Autrey is in attendance..

Item 1500: Form 48 Reformat was discussed next. SCE is proposing to format Form 48 as landscape in that this would make the form user friendlier. After discussion it was agreed that both formats would be acceptable. The new format would be announced at the next Board meeting when Ms. Hernandez reports on the ad hoc meeting.

Under miscellaneous items the first bulleted issue is **Pole Class on Form 48 and Form 7**. This information is to be uploaded on the web JPA alert.

Second bullet is **Review of Cable Tags**. Ms. Corella would upload all cable tags pictures received from members onto the SCJPC.net website.

Third bulleted concern is **Sec. 4.0 for incoming member and 4.1-** record to show existing unauthorized attachment by another member. This is to be discussed at the Board meeting and then placed on the JPA Alert: *On preliminary JPA, when there is an unauthorized member on pole, the unauthorized member's grade and space should be notated in parenthesis on the record side of the prelim, even though they are not on record to inform JPC staff where unauthorized is attached.*

Fourth bulleted item is, **Why is sales tax applied to Salvage when PTS is done?** Mr. Wolfe inquired if anyone remembers when this practice was implemented and why? Ms. Hernandez responded that she maintained a list of sales tax provided by the SCJPC when she was employed by Pacific Bell.

Mr. Chow stated that sales tax is implemented in the pole price definition of elements; therefore, this could be the driver. The sales tax is included in the FOB pole price. Mr. Wolfe inquired what the JPC staff base the amount of sales tax? Ms. Baccus responded on the amount of salvage value. After a brief discussion, Mr. Wolfe stated that his question has been answered to his satisfaction. This bulleted item is to be closed.

Last on miscellaneous is **pole number font size on JPAs**. Ms. Baccus inquired if there could be a standard font size for poles when listed on JPAs. She added that the office receives JPAs with different font sizes for poles, and some are so small that they are difficult to read. The JPA number at times is also a problem in regards to font size. She is proposing

font size 11. The members responded that the font size depends on respective member software and it would be difficult to expect standardization on font size.

Mr. Wolfe stated that with the implementation of iPAM all fonts would be standardized.

The consensus is that standardizing the font size is not doable at this time; however, Ms. Hernandez would raise this issue at the next Board meeting and request from members that they use the largest font size possible on their final JPAs.

Review of action items:

- Item 1496 to be moved from Routine to Authorized Cost.
- Ms. Baccus to create scenarios for proposed 2-tier proposal for section 4.1
- Ms. Corella to compile and upload onto SCJPC.net the contact list for pole inspection reporting received from Ms. Haney. After upload send follow-up email to members requesting they review list to ensure contact party is correct
- Ms. Corella to get cable tag pictures up on website under member's information.
- Mr. Eastwood to coordinate meeting with SCE and members pertaining to Item 1472.

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m. until April, 2010.

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 13, 2010

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:

Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Cory Autrey – Sprint-Nextel
Mr. Justin Cashmer – Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Jeff Wolf – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Steve Rodriguez – T-Mobile USA (teleconference)
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Serv/AT&T Comm
Ms. Alicia Smith – AT&T Local Serv/AT&T Comm
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff
Mr. Kyle Levy – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by addressing the first issue on the agenda, **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. She inquired if any members have concerns with the list of outstanding JPAs sent from members to the initiating members. She added that this list is normally sent to members on a monthly basis. There were no questions on this issue.

The next issue addressed is **Compliance with Routine Handbook**. This is a standing agenda item. A 2-step process has been created to address Routine Handbook generic non-compliance issues. Initially, it was agreed to keep this issue open until a pole inspection reporting method is determined. However, Mr. Autrey questioned the connection between the issue of non-compliance and the pole inspection reporting issue.

Ms. Hernandez responded that she believes the pole inspection reporting should be incorporated into the non-compliance issue and how the committee would handle mediation in regards to pole inspection reporting.

Mr. Autrey stated that in his opinion, the two items are separate issues.

Mr. Rodriguez reported that members have met with SCE in identifying what to report and what not to report on in regards to pole inspections, and believes this is why this item is pending on the pole inspection reporting method. He added that a time frame is to be determined, and questioned if this should be a part of committee responsibility.

Ms. Hernandez stated that Mr. Rodriguez proposed a webpage on the SCJPC.net site for members to post their issues and concerns in regards to non-compliance and non-resolution, thus making the information available to all members

Ms. Hernandez further stated that the 2-step process was once on the discussion calendar of the board agenda, and some members did not support the process, especially the suggestion of bringing the issue to the board for open discussion. She added that members felt this should be anonymous and not be open to discussion and/or possible confrontation. Therefore, this prompted Mr. Rodriguez to propose the webpage for reporting non-compliance.

After discussion it was agreed that these two topics are separate issues. Ms. Hernandez stated that the 2-step process could apply to many issues pertaining to the Routine Handbook. She added that those members that did not support the 2-step process have not offered any further suggestions to approach members in non-compliance other than Mr. Rodriguez's suggestion for the website page.

Therefore, the consensus is to place the 2-step process again on the discussion calendar of the administrative board next meeting.

The third topic of discussion is **Item 1343: Section 4.1 Review of Process and Interpretation**. Mr. Wolfe has created a 2-tier proposal to address this issue, and Ms. Baccus has created a cost comparison for penalties using current year versus year pole set.

The members reviewed the cost comparison provided by Ms. Baccus. Ms. Baccus shared the explanation for her cost comparison. She compared wood, SCE and DWP costs, using current versus proposed (see attachment I).

Mr. Wolfe's 2-tier proposal alludes to service drops, secondary, and street light, and whether a JPA is submitted by the initiating party or a member party to the JPA.

The members discussed Mr. Wolfe's proposal. Ms. Haney stated that this proposal is a bit convoluted. Ms. Hernandez stated that whether the JPA is 4.1 or a 4.0 is contingent on the conscience of the initiator. If the initiating member is of the opinion that this is unauthorized, then the JPA is 4.1. She added that in her opinion that flexibility allotted the initiator, that is the current method utilized by the JPC office, should remain and not dictate how this type of transaction should be billed. Ms. Prescott agrees with Ms. Hernandez.

Ms. Hernandez then proposed that they forego the 2-tier proposal, and the initiating party submits a 4.0 or 4.1 JPA at their discretion. She added that in regards to the penalty, to implement the new proposed costs using current year. She further added section 11.0 addresses service drops, and if member have concerns with service drops, they should review this section.

The consensus is to place the proposed costs of basing the penalty on current year set, on the April board agenda discussion calendar.

Next issue for discussion is **Item 1446: Section 4.0 review and interpretation**. Ms. Hernandez stated that she did not have the opportunity to convene with Mr. Chow to create and propose a billing process. Mr. Eastwood stated that what has been discussed is the situation where a member has issued a 4.0 JPA, and after a specific time frame, another member party to that specific JPA could final the JPA, without waiting for the Form 48.

Ms. Hernandez stated that Mr. Chow had earlier proposed that if a multiple pole JPA has are 4.0 on a specific JPA, to partially finalizing the 4.0 portion of the JPA. This means that the JPA in question would be finalized more than once.

Ms. Haney stated that normally her organization issues a Form 7 and creates a new JPA. She added that the paper trail would be very difficult. She further added that perhaps it would be prudent to delay this discussion until a meeting where Mr. Chow is in attendance.

Mr. Eastwood stated that in regards to 4.0, SCE runs into roadblocks where members have a 4.0 JPA pending in SCE records. He added that any transactions for that specific pole(s) are pending for that 4.0 JPA to final. This is a problem within SCE, especially with pole replacement JPAs.

Ms. Hernandez stated that this pertains to two issues. The purchasing of poles, 4.0, prior to attachment and any work completed, records only type job. She suggested in a 4.0 JPA to move forward with final billing without waiting for the Form 48, since the space is being reserved. She added that a Form 48 can be submitted noting "Records Only" on field work required, then final bill. In her opinion this should be stated in the handbook. She reported that Mr. Chow proposed members must purchase the pole if they want to reserve the space. If another member chooses to purchase, that member with reserved space is joint on the pole.

Mr. Autrey stated that the iPAM program would resolve many of these issues in that every JPA in every step of the process would be in the pole database, and would not allow action on a pole if that specific pole exists on an active JPA in the database.

Ms. Hernandez agreed with Mr. Autrey in that implementation of the iPAM software would in fact resolve many issues regarding the sequential processing of JPAs.

This issue is to remain open for further discussion.

The fifth issue on the agenda is **Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement**. Mr. Eastwood reported that he is attempting to schedule a meeting to address members concerns.

Ms. Haney stated that her organization has many concerns in that they are processing large checks payable to SCE without fully understanding what and why they are being charged the costs, and also they are receiving partial refunds and they are unable to identify the refund. They do not receive an itemized statement with an explanation. Mr. Eastwood responded that he would research this and contact Ms. Haney. He added that he is aware that a higher manager has met with NextG to address these concerns.

Ms. Prescott inquired if SCE is meeting with members individually. She added that this issue concerns all members, and all members concerns should be addressed by SCE individually or collectively. She added that historically, communication was allowed to replace poles with power. Ms. Hernandez added that members are now not allowed to replace power, and they are restricted in replacing guy poles as well.

Ms. Haney stated that it appears that one SCE department changes a method unbeknownst to higher management. She added that NextG then must connect with a VP of SCE to gain a response toward resolution.

Mr. Eastwood responded that when joint pole office receives direction from an SCE VP they immediately respond.

In conclusion, Mr. Autrey stated that this item has been an open item for some time, and it appears that members are requesting answers and/or some action in response to this issue.

Mr. Eastwood stated that he has been attempting to connect with those who are the greatest resistance in regards to this issue within his organization. He requested members directly send him an email with their questions and concerns so when he meets with those responsible for pole replacement he brings the issues to the table. His email address is: james.eastwood@sce.com.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1494: PTD of Composite Poles**. Ms. Hernandez stated that all are in agreement that the setting party should remove the poles. She added that Mr. Chow is to provide costs and methods entailed in removing this type poles.

Mr. Eastwood stated that the construction methods manager has retired. Prior to his leaving SCE, he notified Mr. Eastwood that he too is in agreement that the setting party be responsible for removing this type poles. He added that he would be meeting with his replacement and would report back to the committee his findings.

This item is to remain open at this time.

Item 1495: Pole Inspections is next on the agenda. Ms. Hernandez reported that the proposal for section 6 – pole loading, as well as the technical information, has been approved by the ad hoc,. She added that the next discussion is how to share this information amongst members. Ms. Hernandez questioned if attaching the loading data sheets to the JPA is a good method. Ms. Haney stated that she would prefer a softcopy of the data sheets. Ms. Prescott stated that she too would prefer a soft copy since at times there are five members on a pole.

A proposal is to send the prelim JPA with a note stating that email to follow with loading data sheets attached.

Mr. Eastwood stated that the OIR continues to have workshops. Ms. Hernandez inquired if the ad hoc should wait for the OIR prior to creating an exchange of data method.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that the OIR is considering a 10-15 day time frame for exchanging data. He suggested setting up an FTP to share loading information electronically.

Mr. Autrey stated that a method should be created to ensure that the final loading data version is saved on FTP.

Ms. Haney suggested dating the data each time it is revised.

Ms. Hernandez proposed giving this issue an item number for the computer communications ad hoc committee. **Item 1503: Create FTP for Pole Loading Information** has been assigned to the computer communications ad hoc committee.

The members than reviewed the proposal for section 6.0 and 6.1 to ensure the verbiage is correct. The members created steps if the result is an overloaded pole as a note at the bottom of the page (see attachment II).

The members then reviewed the technical resource which is a document to be posted on the SCJPC.net web site for reference. The members reviewed and discussed the resource document. It was agreed to remove the 6.0 through 6.5 references on the technical document.

The ad committee revised section 16 by adding section 16.1-C (see attachment III) in regards to setting depth noted in the technical resource.

This item is to remain open.

Item 1498: LA County Permits Process/Fee was next on the agenda. Ms. Hernandez stated that this item is open at the request of Mr. Autrey.

Mr. Autrey stated that he believes AT&T California is working off line with the county on this issue.

Mr. Chow stated that his organization continues to work with the county toward a resolution.

The consensus is to leave this item open should any issues arise in regards to the LA county permits. This is to be a standing item until the end of this year.

The next topic for discussion is **Item 1501: Tenants and Purchase of Space**. Ms. Hernandez stated that this pertains to the options members have in regards to tenants when purchasing space. This was prompted by a reference in last month's Board meeting minutes. Using E as an example, she stated the 3 options as:

1. Purchase 24-1 and 22-4, leaving 23-1 for E tenant
2. Purchase 24-6 and take the E tenant under a agreement
3. Purchase 24-6 and E and the incoming member split the foot at 23-1.

She added that this requires discussion. If the incoming member opts for option 2, this must be stated on the JPA. However, an incoming member does not automatically take an existing member's tenant.

Mr. Autrey stated that the record would show that the tenant belongs to the incoming member, and inquired how to verify that the incoming member negotiated a lease agreement.

Ms. Hernandez responded that since the tenant is originally an E tenant, E must contact their tenant to negotiate an agreement with the new owner of space.

Mr. Eastwood stated that it appears that with option 2, one is forcing a tenant on another member in order for that member to gain access to the pole, and on the other end the original owner is losing revenue.

Ms. Haney stated that all three parties would require agreement.

Mr. Chow stated that he is in agreement with Ms. Hernandez that an incoming member does not automatically take an existing member's tenant. He added that documentation should be created stating this.

The members reviewed section *17.0 Non-Owner Attachments*.

Mr. Autrey stated that the assumption has always been that the tenant is to remain with the original owner. He inquired as to what prompted this concern.

Mr. Chow responded that it started as a billing question. The method has always been that the original member with the tenant and the incoming member share the foot where the tenant is attached. He added that it is likely SCE would maintain that foot where their tenant is attached.

Ms. Hernandez reiterated that an incoming member cannot take a tenant with the exception of relinquishment. She added that option 2 is void. The other two options are valid. It was agreed to close this item and place this information on the JPA Alert.

Mr. Chow asked that we keep Option 2, there may be a time a member would like to relinquish their tenant agreement. The likelihood of the happening is small, but it can happen.

The tenth topic for discussion is Item 1502: Taxing Instructions Directive. This was brought to the table by AT&T California. The concern is what location the sales tax is based on. Is it the office where the JPA is initiated, the member's municipality, or the county where the pole is located? Ms. Baccus stated that Mr. Wolfe wants standardization of where on the JPA the billing associate is to obtain this information. Ms. Baccus stated that normally the taxing instructions match the community.

Ms. Haney stated if the taxing instruction cell was removed from the JPA, how would it impact the JPC office?

Ms. Baccus responded that a city must be identified when there is a PTS. If there is no information, the office takes the pole location for sales tax information.

Ms. Haney stated her training is the location of where the pole is purchased should be used as the taxing instructions.

Ms. Hernandez stated that ATC used Irvine where their office is situated.

Mr. Chow stated that this would depend on the accounting methods of each member.

Ms. Hernandez called attention to JPA example on page 18-6 that states in regards to taxing instructions, "Show location (City or County) of each representative's office". She stated that this should be standardized and that all members should research within their respective organizations what their taxing instructions are based on. The ad hoc would then determine if the example on page 18-6 requires revision. The members would return next month with the results of their research. This item is to remain open.

Lastly, miscellaneous items were addressed. The first bulleted item is an example for *clearance attachment for section 18*, brought to the table by Ms. Jean Baccus. Ms. Baccus stated that she received a call from a member staff inquiring about clearance attachments. She added she would like clarification of what is and what is not a clearance attachment and she created an example.

Ms. Hernandez stated that a clearance attachment is when there is an existing lead and you inter-set a pole, that if you remove the pole and it does not affect other members on the pole, then this is a clearance attachment, and the other members must attach to the pole due to GO 95.

Mr. Autrey stated that other members need not be concerned with attaching but for the fact that one member placed an inter-set pole and placing member gives existing members a clearance to attach.

Ms. Baccus suggested an example for clearance attachment be placed in the handbook and the basic JPA training module

After extensive discussion, it was agreed to add the verbiage, "Refer to appropriate authorized cost", to section 9.1.

The next bulleted item is a request to *standardize solely owned pole indicator*. Ms. Baccus stated that 100, all, and ent are currently used. She suggested using 100 which would work well with iPAM when it is implemented. It was agreed that the standard indicator for solely owned poles would be 100. This will be on the JPA Alert page of the SCJPC.net website.

Ms. Hernandez revisited *changes made on a multi-party JPA*. She stated that she and Mr. Wolfe discussed how members on multi-party JPAs would be notified of changes. After

extensive discussion, it was agreed that the verbiage in Section 18.1-B (3) would be revised. The proposed revision would be on the discussion calendar of the April agenda.

Last on miscellaneous is Form 7 – Major versus minor corrections. Ms. Hernandez reported that she communicated with DWP and gave an example. She stated a JPA is initiated to replace poles, and then it is decided not to replace but to purchase poles. She added that she has historically treated this situation as a revised JPA; however, it is not stated in the Routine Handbook. The members extensively reviewed and discussed section 18.1-C. It was agreed to add an additional bullet to this section that reads as follows, “Change in scope of work (i.e. changes causing receiving member to reengineer and/or re-field)”.

Review of action items:

- Place 2-step process for non-compliance on discussion calendar of April board meeting.
- Section 4.1 proposed penalty cost on discussion calendar of April Board meeting.
- Mr. Eastwood to coordinate meeting for SCE pole replacement requirements between members and SCE. Members to email Mr. Eastwood with their questions and concerns in preparation for the meeting.
- Mr. Eastwood to contact newly hired construction methods manager in regards to PTD of composite poles.
- Item 1503 – Create FTP for Pole Loading Information has been assigned to the Computer Communications ad hoc committee.
- Pole Loading section 6 and technical resource to be on discussion calendar of April board meeting.
- JPA Alert for Tenants and Purchasing of Space will be uploaded to SCJPC.net website.
- Ad hoc members to research within their respective organizations to determine how taxing instructions are processed and report back to ad hoc next month.
- Ms. Baccus to create generic clearance attachment example for section 18 not using SCE as utility.
- JPA Alert for solely owned poles indicator is now standardized as **100%**
- Form 7 – Major versus minor revision to section 18.1-C (b) to be on discussion calendar of April board meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m. until May, 2010.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

ATTACHMENT I

COST COMPARISON FOR PROPOSED SECTION 4.1 with 2010 Pole Prices

Wood Prices

45'

Joint

Yr Set 2007

Yr Set 1995

Multi 1995

Current Cost Calculation		
Com Area + 1'	Penalty	Total Cost
963	481	1444
228	114	342
86	43	129

Proposed Cost Calculation		
Com Area +1	Penalty	Total Cost
963	465	1428
228	465	693
86	174	260

*

*Pole Prices decreased for 2010

Edison Prices

45'

Joint

Yr Set 2007

Yr Set1995

Multi 2007

Current Cost Calculation		
Com Area + 1'	Penalty	Total Cost
1067	534	1601
228	114	342
400	200	600

Proposed Cost Calculation		
Com Area +1	Penalty	Total Cost
1067	810	1877
228	810	1038
400	304	704

City of L.A.

45'

Joint

Yr Set 2007

Yr Set1995

Multi 2007

Current Cost Calculation		
Com Area + 1'	Penalty	Total Cost
911	455	1366
228	114	342
341	171	512

Proposed Cost Calculation		
Com Area +1	Penalty	Total Cost
911	538	1449
228	538	766
341	202	543

Proposed Cost Calculation for Sec 4.1: Purchase of interest at structural value based on year pole was set. 50% penalty based on current year new pole cost apportioned to owners of record for common space and 50% penalty based on current year new pole cost for full value of space occupied by unauthorized attachment to owner of said space.

NOTE: Multi Costs were calculated for a two-party pole being purchased Sec 4.1 buy a third party Cost shown is for the owner selling 1' of space, the other owner bills a lesser amount.

Attachment II

POLE LOADING – SCJPC PROPOSED SECTION 6

6.0 Scope

Construction and maintenance of poles, anchors, guys and other attachments under the SCJPC Routine shall at all times conform to the laws of the State of California, Order of the Public Utilities Commission (GO 95) and rules and regulations of other legally authorized bodies having jurisdiction. Members initiating construction on jointly owned poles are responsible for performing total pole loading as described in GO95, rule 91.2 to ensure poles meet the applicable minimum safety factor.

6.1 Pole Loading Collaboration Between Members

Any Member planning to perform work on a pole is responsible for gathering all pole/anchor data necessary to perform total pole loading. When the type of facilities in the field cannot be readily identified, the Initiating Member shall contact applicable pole owners to request facility information/maps (wire sizes, equipment sizes) to aid in completing total pole loading calculations prior to submitting a Form 2 Preliminary JPA. (Refer to GO 95 Rule 44.2)

A Member requesting facility information from another owner(s) shall not construct until all facility information has been identified from all parties and total pole loading calculations have been completed with confirmation that the safety factor meets GO 95 minimum requirements.

The Initiating Member is responsible to address and reconcile any pole loading issues identified by other owner(s). In cases where Members disagree with each others loading calculations, Engineering representatives shall work together to verify the data used (facility information, spans, HOA, etc) and establish a final calculation.

The Initiating Member must submit completed Pole **Loading** Data Sheets to other owner(s) along with the Form 2 Preliminary JPA.

NOTE:

- **Overloaded pole due to Initiating Member proposed attachment.**
 1. Initiating member to resolve issue and provide final pole loading data sheets.
 2. Should pole replacement be required, use Sec 7.3
- **Overloaded pole prior to Initiating Member proposed attachment.**
 1. Initiating member to provide the failed pole loading data sheets along with the final resolved pole loading data sheets.
 2. Should pole replacement be required, use Sec 7.11
- **Documenting pole overload resolutions and sharing information. Pending creation of FTP.**

Attachment III – Revision to section 16

16.1-C Increased Pole Setting Depth

When poles are set deeper, the increased setting depth (in feet) shall be noted on the Form 2 within the “Location and Nature of Work”. The increased setting depth adds to the common area and reduces the usable space divided among owners for their exclusive use.

Note: The overall pole height above ground would be less than depicted in the “Grade and Space Chart by Pole Height”. Example: A 45’ pole set 2’ deeper requires the top of pole be depicted on the Form 2 as 37’, not 39’. The usable space would be 13’, not 15’ and the common area would be 32’ not 30’.

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

June 8, 2010

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 10:20 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Cory Autrey – Sprint-Nextel
Mr. Justin Cashmer – Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks (teleconference)
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Serv/AT&T Comm
Ms. Alicia Smith – AT&T Local Serv/AT&T Comm
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by addressing the first issue on the agenda, **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. She reported that SCE has not sent her office a status list of foreign JPAs since SCE is involved with implementing their SAP application. Mr. Chow reported that SCE should resume to normal operation shortly. This is a standing agenda item.

The next issue addressed is **Compliance with Routine Handbook**. This is a standing agenda item. Ms. Hernandez stated that in her opinion, this issue is an operating issue, and should be reassigned to the Operating ad hoc committee. In that the 2-step process to address non-compliance has been approved the next issue is an arbitration process should arbitration be required. This item is now assigned to the Operating ad hoc committee.

The third topic of discussion is **Item 1343: Section 4.1 Review of Process and Interpretation**. The new penalty fee has been approved at the April 2010 meeting. However, what remains to be addressed is the 2-tier penalty proposal suggested by AT&T California. One tier is the service drops. She added that what is needed is clarification of what constitutes a service drop, therefore the members then reviewed Section 11 for clear and concise clarification. The members again discussed and reviewed the 2-tier proposal submitted by AT&T California. Mr. Wolfe supports the new penalty fee, however, is of the opinion that the old penalty fee process should apply for service drops, thus resulting in his proposed 2-tier penalty process.

After review and discussion of Section 11, it was agreed to add verbiage to section 11.0 and 11.1 to aid in clarification of service drops (see attachment I).

Ms. Hernandez stated that in her opinion, there is no need for a 2-tier process, and that loading should not be an issue of unauthorized attachment.

Mr. Chow stated that if this were an SCE only decision, he would not support the 2-tier proposal, but the one higher penalty only. However, he added that this is a collaborative, and SCE

would get opposition from AT&T California and Verizon California. He further added that the original concern with Section 4.1 is the impact on SCE and members who are unauthorized, and SCE has long been seeking a resolution to the problem.

The members again reviewed the 2-tier proposal and it was agreed that the verbiage should be revised. Ms. Hernandez stated that the two tiers are 1) service drop requiring purchase, and 2) mainline regardless of whoever initiates the JPA. Mr. Autrey stated that it should be noted in section 4 that at the initiators option, section 4.0 could be applied.

The consensus is that a 2-tier penalty would be created. SCE would revise the language in the 2-tier proposal for clarification prior to creating sections 4.1-A, and 4.1-B to be applied to the 2- tier proposal.

Next issue for discussion is **Item 1446: Section 4.0 review and interpretation.** Ms. Hernandez stated that this issue could be tabled in that it is contingent on the outcome of Item 1343. This item is to remain open.

The fifth issue on the agenda is **Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement.** Mr. Eastwood reported that he did receive questions and concerns from Mr. Autrey in preparation for the meeting. He added that he would continue to attempt to coordinate a meeting to answer the member's questions and concerns.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1494: PTD of Composite Poles.** Ms. Hernandez stated that all are in agreement that the setting party should remove the poles. Mr. Chow reported that in researching within his organization, it is agreed that if the pole is set by SCE, that SCE should be the party to PTD.

Mr. Hunter reported that DWP is starting to implement Ductile iron poles; therefore a new item has been added to section 15.7-DI (Ductile Iron) as another alternative to wood poles.

While reviewing section 15, section 15.6 – Minimum Pole Class Requirements was revised by adding the following verbiage: “Pole class on new pole set is required”.

An additional bullet has been added to this item, “Add verbiage to section 7.14/create section 5.14. This item is to remain open at this time for further discussion.

Item 1495: Pole Inspections is next on the agenda. Sections 6.0 and 6.1 have been created to address inspections. The new sections were discussed at the April board meeting.

Mr. Chow reported that Mr. Stonerock of SCE has conducted several meetings to determine issues and infractions that members agree upon to exchange information. He added that an agreed upon pole inspection form should be utilized.

Ms. Haney responded that NextG has a form that they currently utilize and would likely not use an agreed upon form.

Mr. Chow recommended having all forms reviewed by the committee to ensure that all necessary information is included.

Ms. Hernandez questioned why the new pole loading sections (6.0-6.1) is associated with this item addressing pole inspections.

Ms. Corella stated that initially this item was assigned to Routine when discussion opened on the new inspections ruling. It was decided that this topic required a separate ad hoc committee; therefore, the pole loading ad hoc committee was created. Mr. Wolfe, the chair of the pole loading ad hoc committee shared what the NCJPA has created in regards to the new ruling, sections 6.0 and 6.1. The sections were then assigned to Routine for review and revising, with the possibility of adding the sections to the handbook.

Mr. Chow stated that Mr. Rodriguez questioned if there ever is duplication of the inspection process based on the OIR, could the cost be billed through the JPC process? He added that per the OIR, all members are mandated to handle pole inspections individually.

The members discussed the current contact list available on the SCJPC web site. It was noted that cable TV does not have access to this list.

Two additional bullet items were added to this item, 1) review of contact lists, and 2) review and finalize the infraction list. This item to remain open for further discussion.

Item 1498: LA County Permits Process/Fee was next on the agenda. Ms. Hernandez stated that it is agreed to keep this issue open until the end of the year.

The ninth topic for discussion is **Item 1502: Taxing Instructions Directive**. Ms. Hernandez questioned if any members have any information to share in regards to taxing instructions. Mr. Wolfe reported that AT&T California agreed to stop issuing tax in the North with the exception of PTS poles which AT&T California will not pay tax. There was no further discussion on this item. This item is to remain open at this time.

Item 1505: Review of Section 11 was discussed concurrently with Item 1343. This item is now closed.

Last assigned topic for discussion is **Item 1506: Form 9 Review/Approval**. Ms. Hernandez reported that it was agreed that the time frame for a Form 9 would be 15 days. The notice was posted on the JPA Alert page, but was not incorporated into the handbook. Section 18.9 Form 9 – Riser has been revised with the verbiage, “*Form 9 is automatically approved after 15 have elapsed from date sent*”. Ms. Hernandez would inform the board members at the June 2010 meeting.

Lastly, miscellaneous items were addressed. The first issue discussed was brought to the table by Ms. Jean Baccus. She reported the office has been receiving JPAs where the base owner relinquishes entirely, and the purchasing party is not retagging the pole with their respective pole number code. She questioned if the previous owners number should remain. She added that section 5.1-B addresses the renumbering of relinquished poles.

Mr. Chow responded that there will be instances when the pole number code is not the base owner code.

Ms. Pranata stated that the current application FRIEND utilized by the JPC office would not accept a pole number that is not in line with the base owner.

Mr. Chow stated that he is certain that today there are poles in the field where the member code is not a current member on that specific pole.

Ms. Hernandez stated that if the pole tag is not changed to the new base owner, members choosing to purchase would send their paperwork to the original base owner creating problems and delays for all members involved..

After discussion is was agreed that the best action in this situation is for the new base owner to retag the pole with their pole number.

Mr. Chow agreed that SCE would correct the JPA Ms. Baccus brought to the table.

In the sake of time the remaining issues on miscellaneous would be tabled.

Review of action items:

- Mr. Chow to revise 2-tier process proposal with new language.
- Mr. Eastwood would continue to plan a meeting with SCE and committee members in regards to Item 1472

- Second agenda item is to be moved to Operating committee.
- Members to be prepared to discuss PTD of alternative to wood poles.
- Ms. Hernandez to inform members at next Board meeting the time frame for Form 9.
- Section 15 revised to address notation of pole class on record.

The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m. until June, 2010.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

FREE ATTACHMENTS

11.0 Service Drops

This section relates to the convention of reciprocity as it applies to Members owning parallel pole lines and crossing streets for the sole purpose of providing service.

Service drops are the conductors between the building or structure served and the adjacent line pole. The use of more than one pole in any direction shall constitute a line extension, and shall be governed by the rules of the Routine in the same manner as they are applicable to other line facilities.

Crossing and Conflicts: Constructing Member erecting pole shall provide, at crossings and conflicts, space for existing service wires of other Members involved in addition to space to be used or reserved for its own requirements. Purchase of interest shall not be required for such service wire attachments and cost of installation thereof shall be borne by constructing Member.

In the replacement of a pole set under the above conditions, the owner shall continue to provide a free space except where the service Member requests a taller pole, or maintained a pole top extension on the pole being replaced.

Space Clearance: A joint owner installing service wires which obstruct vertical or horizontal clearance of space reserved by another joint owner, either on the pole or in the span, shall be responsible for clearing the obstructed space.

Where a free attachment obstructs additional space required by the owner of a pole, the Member maintaining the free attachment shall provide clearance at their own expense.

Where service crossing mid span obstructs the space requirements of the owner of the line crossed, the Member maintaining the service shall be responsible for clearing such space. If mid span service obstructs a line owner's future needs, the service owner shall pay the cost of clearing the service except as it may be agreed that rearrangement of the service is of mutual benefit.

Section 4.1 does not apply.

(Revised January 2011)

11.1 Purchase Requirements

Form 2 Record is required for all service drops whether purchase is required or not. The basic rules of purchase are:

- (a) If a pole is used by more than one Member for a like purpose, purchase is required.
- (b) When a service attachment requires that guying be used, purchase is required.
- (c) If no additional space is required, multiple drops can be served without purchase. (e.g. multiple service drop connector box, single spool dead-end)

(d) The use of more than one pole in any direction, purchase is required.

(Revised January 2011)

See example on reverse side.

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

July 13, 2010

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:

Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel
Mr. Chuck Johnson – Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe –AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Serv/AT&T Comm
Mr. Steve Rodriguez – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by addressing the first issue on the agenda; the **review of** the previous month's **meeting minutes**. The members reviewed the minutes to refresh the status of the agenda items. Ms. Hernandez then gave a brief synopsis on the meeting.

Ms. Hernandez reported that an issue brought to the table by Ms. Baccus is when a base owner relinquishes a pole; the purchasing party is not retagging the pole with their respective pole number code. She added that since SCE intends on reusing the same pole number when replacing a pole, this could become an issue. She then gave an example of the base owner being VZ and relinquishing to SCE and, if SCE does not retag the pole, then it appears that VZ is the base owner and not SCE.

Mr. Chow stated that this issue has been discussed within his organization, and they are making procedural changes in that poles in this situation would require a new pole number. He added that other than wood poles would require a new pole number in that it would be SCE that would PTD the pole(s).

There was no further discussion on the prior month's meeting minutes.

Ms. Hernandez then moved to the miscellaneous portion of the agenda and addressed the bullet titled a **disclaimer to the Routine or website**. She created a disclaimer which is included in the packet for the current meeting. She reported that the CPSD is of the opinion that the SCJPC is not doing its job in ensuring that all members follow GO 95. Their findings are that the SCJPC is lacking in their job performance of ensuring members abide by CPUC set standards. She added that the CPSD does not know the job and purpose of the SCJPC. Therefore, Ms. Hernandez added that in her opinion, perhaps a disclaimer stating what the SCJPC is responsible for and what it is not. She further added that she took information from the history page of the SCJPC.net website as a guide in creating the disclaimer draft (attachment I). The members reviewed the disclaimer draft. Ms.

Hernandez stated that she would like to revise the last sentence on the disclaimer by adding the verbiage, "and polices". Mr. Rodriguez stated that the CPUC does not police today as it may have in the past. He added that the CPUC governs utilities, not the SCJPC, and it is the responsibility of members to abide to the CPUC rulings. The SCJPC does not govern in the JPA process to ensure that attachments meet state regulations. What needs separation is the approval in the process and CPUC regulations standard.

Mr. Chow stated that the Agreement states that members will abide to CPUC standards, but it does not state that the SCJPC would enforce these standards. Again, it is the responsibility of every member to comply with CPUC standards. It is not the job of the committee to police fellow members to ensure they follow state regulations.

Ms. Hernandez reiterated that she would like a disclaimer stating that SCJPC members do not govern one another, and each individual member is responsible for state regulations.

Mr. Wolfe stated that findings of the OII (order to institute an investigation) is that the committee has principals and procedures to attach and construct on poles, and it has been discovered that there is not great collaboration amongst SCJPC members in exchanging loading information. Ms. Haney stated that in her opinion, this statement is incorrect. Mr. Wolfe responded that when audits are performed, it is revealed that there are many JPAs that have been automatically approved. Therefore, it appears that there is not much collaboration amongst SCJPC members. In summation, Mr. Wolfe stated that this might be how the CPSD is arriving at the conclusion that the SCJPC is not doing their job, however, he supports creating a disclaimer.

Ms. Hernandez reiterated that she is of the opinion that some type of disclaimer is in order to be published on the SCJPC.net website. A suggestion is to place a disclaimer sentence on the history page of the web site.

Mr. Eastwood suggested stating what the SCJPC does and is responsible for, and not what the SCJPC does not do and is not responsible for.

It is noted that in the agreement, Section 17, Compliance with Laws, states, "Each member shall comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws, rules and regulations, and any revisions or supplements thereto".

After extensive discussion, it was agreed to rewrite the draft disclaimer. Ms. Hernandez stated that perhaps disclaimer is a misnomer, and the document should be referred to as a clarification document. Ms. Hernandez added that she would continue working on verbiage for this issue. Mr. Chow stated that he would also attempt to create verbiage to address this concern. This issue has been given an item number, **Item 1508: Clarification of JPC Responsibilities.**

Next under miscellaneous issues, Ms Hernandez addressed **Pole Butt in place and consequences** brought to the table by AT&T California. Mr. Wolfe opened discussion by reading an email he received from Ms. Mary Misemer of the Department of Toxic Substances Control in regards to PTD (see attachment III). He reported that AT&T California is attempting to clean up any backlog of pole replacement. He added that pole butts should be removed in that they have been treated with chemicals. He contacted Ms. Misemer to aid him in documenting the departments concern with pole butts to provide to AT&T California contractors. Her response is in the email sent to Mr. Wolfe (attachment III). He added that he wishes to stress to his contractors that there is no question about removing pole butts in that it is a state requirement since pole butts are considered abandoned hazardous waste. Mr. Wolfe concluded by stating that AT&T California would be removing pole butts in all instances regardless of any pushback since it is a state regulation.

Ms. Hernandez next addressed the first item on the agenda, **Interpretation of Routine Handbook.** She reported that this is a standing item. This item is to remain open.

Item 1343: Section 4.1 – Review of Process and Interpretation is next on the agenda. The issue of a 2-tier penalty is currently on open discussion for this issue. Ms. Chow presented his proposals for revisions to this section in the Routine. Mr. Chow revised the original 2-tier proposal provided by AT&T California, and revised verbiage for section 4.1 (see attachment II). The proposal is for sub-sections A and B for a pole owner initiated JPA, one for service drops and the other for mainline/sideline. Service drops would be billed with the old method, and mainline with the new billing method of using the current year's costs. An additional exclusion (d) has been added to section 4.1. This would be instances when the unauthorized member initiates the JPA and it is a service drop.

The members discussed the issues of street lights. It was suggested to discuss placing verbiage into the Routine to address street lights. Mr. Chow suggested adding an additional exclusion clause to section 4.1 for street lights. This item is to remain open for further re-work, and to address street lights.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1446: Section 4.0 Review and interpretation**. This item is related to the aforementioned item; therefore, the consensus is to address this item when the prior item is completed.

The fifth issue on the agenda is **Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement**. Mr. Eastwood stated that he did receive a response to his request that members provide him with their issues and concerns to share with the proper parties within his organization. He is scheduled to meet with the department personnel who handle pole replacement within the next week. He would like to solicit further questions and concerns. Therefore, Ms. Corella would email members requesting they provide Mr. Eastwood with questions to bring to the table at the scheduled meeting with the pole replacement personnel of his organization.

The sixth issue on the agenda is **Item 1494: PTD of Alternative to Wood Poles**. It has been agreed that the setting party is responsible to PTD the alternative to wood poles. Ms. Hernandez suggested placing the same verbiage to sections 7.14 and 5.0 stating that the setting party would PTD other than wood poles. The following verbiage would be added to the abovementioned sections: Note: The setting member would PTD other than wood poles. This item is now closed.

The next topic for discussion is **Item 1495: Pole Inspections**. It was agreed to table this item for the next meeting.

Item 1498: LA County Permits Process/Fees is next on the agenda. This item is to remain open to the end of the year.

Topic nine on the agenda is **Item 1502: Taxing Instructions Directives**. Mr. Wolfe reported that AT&T California is no longer using taxing instructions in the NCJPA with the exception of PTS. After brief discussion it was agreed that taxing info is required for PTS. The city must be notated in the taxing instructions section of the JPA, and the county if it is an unincorporated area. This item is now closed.

Under miscellaneous items the remaining bulleted items were addressed. Verbiage has been added to **section 7.4** as follows: Section 7.4 is not a stand-alone section, must be used in conjunction with section identifying reason for replacement. This verbiage is noted in the JPA Basic Training module, but was omitted in the Routine Handbook. The handbook is to be revised, and a JPA alert would be published.

Next, members discussed the question, “**If a member has a free attachment can they be joint on an anchor**”? The members briefly discussed this topic and it was agreed to table this discussion for the next meeting.

The members then discussed, **obsolete pole tags, member codes**. Ms. Hernandez stated that she noticed Altrio remains in section 20. After brief discussion, it was agreed to send a email notice to all members to review section 20, of the Routine Handbook to ensure that their pole tags identifier is correct, and if not correct to provide a current pole tag identifier.

Lastly, discussed is **excessively long Form 2 numbers** (how they can defeat future mechanization). Mr. Wolfe opened discussion by stating that some Form 2 numbers are so long there are not enough fields in some programs.

Mr. Chow stated that in the South, the members have always been cognitive in regards to long JPA numbers, and made the decision when programming to allow additional fields. After brief discussion, it was agreed to close this topic in that there is no language in the Routine defining the number of characters on a Form 2.

Mr. Hunter opened discussion on **pole class**. He reported that DWP is raising their class of poles. The members reviewed Section 15.6 and the associated table that refers to pole class. Mr. Wolfe stated that in his opinion the pole class is not a part of Routine, but an internal standard within each respective member organization. The members reviewed the pole class chart. Mr. Wolfe inquired the necessity of the chart. After a brief discussion on the section, the consensus is to place section 15.6 and the associated chart on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting.

The review of actions items are as follows:

- Ms. Corella to send 2-tier proposal for Section 4.1 to ad hoc members.
- Ms. Corella to send email to members in regards to Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement.
- Ms. Hernandez and Mr. Chow to create verbiage for clarification of SCJPC responsibilities Item 1508.
- Mr. Chow to continue working on the language for the 2-tier penalty to address street lights.
- JPA alert in regards to taxing instructions.
- JPA alert in regards to section 7.4
- Email to board members to review section 20 to ensure pole tags are correct.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 p.m. until August, 2010.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

ATTACHMENT I

DRAFT (7-12-10)

The Southern California Joint Pole Committee (JPC) is NOT a governing agency.

The Joint Pole Committee is made up of a group of member representatives of utilities and municipalities in Southern California who hold joint equity interest in utility poles. JPC maintains a uniform procedure for **recording ownership** of poles.

The purpose of the Joint Pole Committee is to keep accurate records of ownership for each pole and keep on file a master record of each jointly owned pole. The **principal function** is to calculate the established value of each transaction, involving the sale or purchase of joint pole equity interests or maintenance of those interests.

The Joint Pole Committee office prepares monthly Bills of Sale to the members to enable them to make monetary settlement of their joint enterprises.

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) is the state agency that governs utilities' rules and regulations.

Attachment II

4.1 Unauthorized Attachment

A. Each case requiring joint ownership in a pole shall constitute an unauthorized attachment if the Member making such attachment fails to initiate Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization **or makes attachment prior to approval of Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization**. 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.

Such cases include:

Poles used for service drops; secondary services; or street lights where Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization is initiated by an existing owner of record on pole.

Poles used for mainline/line side cable/conductors and/or strand including self-supporting dielectric cables where Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization is initiated by member with the unauthorized attachment.

B. Each case requiring joint ownership in a pole shall constitute an unauthorized attachment if the Member making such attachment fails to initiate Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization or makes attachment prior to approval of Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization. Said Member shall be required to purchase interest at structural value and pay an added 50% penalty based on current year new pole cost.

Such cases include:

Poles used for mainline/line side cable/conductors and/or strand including self-supporting dielectric cables where Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization is initiated by an existing owner of record on pole.

Excluded from ~~this~~ **these** sections are:

(a) Cases where a joint owner has made attachment on pole at a higher or lower grade than allowed for the space purchased. (This owner must relocate to the proper grade or when allowed, purchase interest in accordance with Section 4.0).

(b) Poles set in current year.

(c) All interset poles where services are originated from clearance attachments thereon. In these cases, purchase of interest shall be required at structural value only, and Member issuing Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization shall specify Routine Section 4.0 for such purchase.

(d) Poles used for service drops (conductors between the building or structure served and the adjacent line pole) when Member with unauthorized attachment initiates Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization. In these cases Routine Section 4.0 for such purchase shall apply.

NOTE 1: This section does not apply to anchors.

NOTE 2: Refer also to Sections 5.4, 7.7, and 16.4B

NOTE 3: Upon mutual agreement Section 4.0 may be used

	ATTACHMENT CATEGORY	ROUTINE SECTION	PENALTY	BILLING	COMMENTS
POLE OWNER INITIATES JPA	Service Drops; Secondary Service; Street Lights	Sec 4.1A	50% structural value year pole set cost.	Current: Purchase of interest at structural value based on year pole was set. 50% penalty based on year pole was set apportioned to owners of record for common space and 50% penalty based on year pole was set for full value of space occupied by unauthorized attachment to owner of said space.	
	Mainline/Line Side; cable and/or strand including self-supporting and/or dielectric cables	Sec 4.1B	50% structural value current year new pole cost.	Proposed: Purchase of interest at structural value based on year pole was set. 50% penalty based on current year new pole cost apportioned to owners of record for common space and 50% penalty based on current year new pole cost for full value of space occupied by unauthorized attachment to owner of said space	4.1 A ?
UNAUTHORIZED ATTACHER INITIATES JPA	Service Drops; Secondary Service; Street Lights	New exclusion (d)	None	Current: Purchase of interest at structural value based on year pole was set. 50% penalty based on year pole was set apportioned to owners of record for common space and 50% penalty based on year pole was set for full value of space occupied by unauthorized attachment to owner of said space.	May need new section (4.1 B ?), will conflict with 4.1 above based on proposed additional lanuage for 4.1 "Each case requiring joint ownership in a pole shall constitute an unauthorized attachment if the Member making such attachment fails to initiate Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization and/or attaches in proposed space before Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization is approved. 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."
	Mainline/Line Side; cable and/or strand including self-supporting and/or dielectric cables	Sec 4.1A	50% structural value year pole set cost.	Current: Purchase of interest at structural value based on year pole was set. 50% penalty based on year pole was set apportioned to owners of record for common space and 50% penalty based on year pole was set for full value of space occupied by unauthorized attachment to owner of said space.	4.1 B ?

Jennie Corella

From: WOLFE, ROBERT A (ATTN:PB) [rw8914@att.com]
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 10:10 AM
To: NCJPA Sylvia Goltes; jennie@scjpc.net
Subject: PTD

Please print this e-mail so it is available in the various committee and ad hoc committee meetings. PTD, PB and now disposal costs are under discussion. In this e-mail I requested feed back from the State of California addressing the concept of leaving a pole but in place and the consequences for doing so.

Utility Poles in general fail the California Hazardous Waste Toxicity Criteria (22CCR 66261.24). So once a utility pole becomes a waste and it or any part of it must be disposed of according to the California Hazardous Waste Act (Chapter 6.5 of the Health and Safety Code) and it's supporting regulations in title 22 of the California Code of Regulation Division 4.5. If it is left on property not owned by the "generator", it is considered abandoned hazardous waste and subject to civil penalties of 25,000/day/violation. (HSC 25189.2(c) and HSC 25189(b)). Each abandoned pole would be considered a separate violation. If the case warrants filing criminal, prison time of up to a year (3 if bodily harm was caused) and criminal fines. People have been sentenced to prison for illegal disposal of hazardous waste.

Mary Miesmer
Department of Toxic Substances Control
Regulatory Assistance Officer
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, California 95826-3200
(916) 255-3617
mimi.miesmer@dtsc.ca.gov

Robert Wolfe
Pacific Bell Telephone Company, AT&T CA.
M&P Process Manager
Rep-NCJPA/SCJPC
C&E Staff-Compliance & Implementation

310 Martin Ave.
Santa Clara, CA. 95050
Ph: 408-980-6714
Fax: 408-986-9585

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are the property of AT&T, are confidential, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom this e-mail is addressed. If you are not one of the named recipient(s) or otherwise have reason to believe that you have received this message in error, please notify the sender at 925 901-7919 and delete this message immediately from your computer. Any other use, retention, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited

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

August 10, 2010

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 12:45 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel
Mr. Robert Wolfe –AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Serv/AT&T Comm
Mr. Steve Rodriguez – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by addressing the first issue on the agenda; the **review of the previous month's meeting minutes**. The members reviewed the minutes. Ms. Hernandez briefly noted the major topics of discussion at the last meeting. There were no questions or concerns in regards to the prior meeting minutes.

Ms. Hernandez next addressed the first item on the agenda, **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. She reported that this is a standing item. This item is to remain open. There were no comments on this item.

Item 1343: Section 4.1 – Review of Process and Interpretation is next on the agenda. The issue of a 2-tier penalty is currently on open discussion for this issue. The members reviewed the latest 2-tier draft proposal prepared by Mr. Chow. The primary cause for the two- tiers for section 4.1 is to address mainline, versus service/secondary. In both tiers, the purchase cost of the pole is to be the cost of the year the pole was set. However, in 4.1-B, which pertains to mainline and if the pole owner initiates the JPA, the penalty cost would be based on the pole cost of the current year, all other situations would not change, and the penalty pole cost would be based on the year the pole was set. The members extensively discussed the several scenarios discovered in regards to this section. It was suggested to place a table for this section in the handbook differentiating the billing options and different situations. The members worked on the table/chart and associated verbiage (see attachment). The consensus is to place the table and associated verbiage on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1446: Section 4.0 Review and interpretation**. This item is related to the aforementioned item. Ms. Hernandez reported that SCE has a method of billing this section and proposed tabling this item at this time until Mr. Chow is present.

The fifth issue on the agenda is Item **1472: Pole Replacement Requirement**. Mr. Eastwood reported that a meeting transpired with the group within his organization. However, the outcome resulted in no major progress. He added that this exercise has educated him in how the pole setting arena has changed since he left GTE (VZ). He further added that at the time of his departure, GTE was in the practice of setting poles through power consistently. Upon his return into the arena he discovered that this was no longer the practice among communication and that SCE had taken on the responsibility. Ms. Hernandez stated that other members are not allowed to replace guy poles as well. He stated that he received information that the change in this practice could have been the result of a CPUC OII. He inquired if anyone is aware at what time this transition in pole replacement transpired? He proposed a word search of “pole replacement” through historical minutes to determine when this change came about.

In conclusion, Mr. Eastwood would continue meeting with his group to arrange a meeting between them and the members.

The next topic for discussion is Item **1495: Pole Inspections**. This is an ongoing issue. Ms. Hernandez reported that SCE is working on a form to notify fellow members of infractions. She inquired if the list is complete? Mr. Eastwood responded that what he has at this time is a list he received from Mr. Stonerock when the members met with Mr. Stonerock and mutually agreed on a list of infractions that would and would not be reported. He added that in regards to contact forms, members were to bring their forms for review.

Ms. Hernandez questioned if the infraction list and contact forms should be an issue for the Routine Revision ad hoc committee. It was agreed to table this issue at this time and those members that have a contact form, to bring it to the next meeting for review.

Item 1498: LA County Permits Process/Fees is next on the agenda. This item is to remain open to the end of the year.

Topic nine on the agenda is **Item 1508: Clarification of JPC Responsibilities**. Ms. Hernandez stated that this issue requires extensive discussion, and she proposed tabling it for the next meeting.

Last on the agenda are **miscellaneous items**. The first bulleted issue is, *“If a member has a free attachment, can they be joint on an anchor”?*

Ms. Walls responded that section 12.1-A states that purchase is required in this situation. This bulleted item is closed.

The second bulleted issue is as follows, *“Section 15.6 Minimum pole class requirement. Does this sections and associated chart continue to be necessary? Discussed at board, chart not necessary. Does section verbiage require revision or deletion?”* It was agreed to delete the section and chart and add the first sentence, “Pole class on new pole set is required” to section 18.1-A. This bulleted item is now closed.

Ms. Pranata raised **billing directive inquiries**. She reported that the office is receiving JPAs with section 4.0 with less than a 6-foot clearance. The JPA is returned to the initiator since it should read section 4.3. She inquired if the JPA could be processed as 4.0?

Ms. Hernandez stated that it could appear not a 6-foot clearance on the JPA, but it is so in the field due to grade. Ms. Hernandez added that the initiator is to notate on the JPA that the field condition is 6-foot clearance. If there is no notation on the JPA, than it should be returned to the initiator.

Next inquiry, Ms. Pranata stated that a current record reflects a guy pole 50/50, and an incoming member is listed on grade and space. On the proposed there are two guys, and one grade

and space, she then inquired as to how the JPC office should bill this JPA? Ms. Hernandez responded that if the incoming member is placing more than a guy they need to purchase that space and there is no safety clearance on a guy pole. The record would read, E-guy/VZ- guy and grade and space for the incoming party.

There were no further inquiries.

The review of actions items are as follows:

- Place Item 1343 with proposed 2-tier penalty on discussion calendar of the Board meeting for August 18, 2010.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m. until September, 2010.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

ATTACHMENT I

4.1 A and B Unauthorized Attachment

Each case requiring joint ownership in a pole shall constitute an unauthorized attachment if the Member making such attachment fails to initiate Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization **or makes attachment prior to approval of Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization.**

Apply as appropriate per chart below:

Initiator	Attachment Category	Section	Billing
Pole Owner	Service Drops; Secondary Service	4.1A	Purchase of interest at structural value based on year pole was set. 50% penalty based on year pole was set apportioned to owners of record for common space and 50% penalty based on year pole was set for full value of space occupied by unauthorized attachment to owner of said space.
Unauthorized Attacher	Service Drops; Secondary Service	4.0	Purchase of interest at structural value based on year pole was set.
Pole Owner	Mainline/Line Side; cable and/or strand including self- supporting and/or dielectric cables	4.1B	Purchase of interest at structural value based on year pole was set. 50% penalty based on current year new pole cost apportioned to owners of record for common space and 50% penalty based on current year new pole cost for full value of space occupied by unauthorized attachment to owner of said space
Unauthorized Attacher	Mainline/Line Side; cable and/or strand including self- supporting and/or dielectric cables	4.1A	Purchase of interest at structural value based on year pole was set. 50% penalty based on year pole was set apportioned to owners of record for common space and 50% penalty based on year pole was set for full value of space occupied by unauthorized attachment to owner of said space.
Incoming Member	Any unauthorized attachments	4.1A	Purchase of interest at structural value based on year pole was set. 50% penalty based on year pole was set apportioned to owners of record for common space and 50% penalty based on year pole was set for full value of space occupied by unauthorized attachment to owner of said space.

Excluded from ~~the~~ **these** sections are:

(a) Cases where a joint owner has made attachment on pole at a higher or lower grade than allowed for the space purchased. (This owner must relocate to the proper grade or when allowed, purchase interest in accordance with Section 4.0).

(b) Poles set in current year.

(c) All interset poles where services are originated from clearance attachments thereon. In these cases, purchase of interest shall be required at structural value only, and Member issuing Form 2 Joint Pole Authorization shall specify Routine Section 4.0 for such purchase.

NOTE 1: This section does not apply to anchors.

NOTE 2: Refer also to Sections 5.4, 7.7, and 16.4B

NOTE 3: With agreement from pole owner of record for space where unauthorized attachment exists Section 4.0 may be used.

16.4-B Existing Attachments Prior to January 1, 1994

All attachments placed by owners of record (see Section 20.1) or lessees under owner's authority (see Section 17.0) prior to the cut-off date of January 1, 1994 will be considered "Existing Attachments". The space grandfathered shall be only for 1' of occupied space. Any additional space not shown on record shall be purchased per section 4.1A ~~X~~ without penalty. A Member identifying such a "grandfathered" attachment will record this information on the next Joint Pole Authorization prepared on that pole for record purposes.

7.7 Replacement of Pole Which Is Used Jointly Without Authority

Any Member maintaining an unauthorized attachment on a pole to be replaced shall:

- Purchase interest in existing pole **as specified in Section 4.1** ~~at structural value with a 50% penalty.~~
- Receive salvage if applicable.
- Pay pulling, transportation, and disposal.
- Transfer at own expense.
- Purchase interest in the replacing pole.

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

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

- Purchase interest in existing pole **as specified in Section 4.1** ~~at structural value with a 50% penalty.~~
- Receive salvage if applicable.
- Pay pulling, transportation and disposal.

5.4 Unauthorized Attachment - Procedure When All Members Abandon and Remove Pole

Member with unauthorized attachment to pole shall purchase interest **as specified in Section 4.1** ~~at structural value, with 50% added as an Authorized Cost.~~ Each Member shall abandon, receive salvage, and pay pulling and transportation.

Other Sections:

- 7.8 – no change required
- 14.6 – no change required
- 19.0 – needs to be fixed (unrelated to 4.1 revision)

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

September 14, 2010

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 9:00 am. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Kourtney Wietecha – NextG Networks (teleconference)
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Serv/AT&T Comm
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Mr. Kyle Levy – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by addressing the first issue on the agenda; the **review of the previous month's meeting minutes**. She gave a brief synopsis of the meeting as a refresher. There were no comments or questions.

Ms. Hernandez then addressed the next item on the agenda, **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. She stated that this is a standing item. This item is to remain open. There were no comments on this item.

Item 1343: Section 4.1 – Review of Process and Interpretation is next on the agenda. She reported that this item is on the agenda, under the consent calendar, of the Administrative Board meeting scheduled to meet the following day.

The fourth issue on the agenda is **Item 1446: Section 4.0 Review and interpretation**. Ms. Hernandez stated that if and when Section 4.1 is approved, then the committee would concentrate further on this item. She added that just because a member issues a JPA and attaches prior to approval does not constitute utilizing Section 4.0. Mr. Chow stated that there are concerns he would like to discuss in regards to this item. Ms. Hernandez reiterated that the committee would further discuss this topic when and if Section 4.1 is approved.

The fifth issue on the agenda is **Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement**. Ms. Hernandez reported that Mr. Eastwood is in the process of coordinating a meeting to address this issue. Mr. Chow added that he spoke to someone within his organization that is in the management area of pole placement. The aforementioned individual inquired as to what prompted the discussion in the 1990's that SCE would be the only party allowed to replace poles. Mr. Chow stated that he believes the majority of the decision is based on an OII directive. This individual is attempting to research the decision made by SCE in the 1990's. Mr. Chow concluded that this issue is being discussed at a higher level, which could aid in resolving this committee concern.

The next topic for discussion is **Item 1495: Pole Inspections**. Ms. Hernandez stated that the NCJPA is recommending utilizing NJUNS for the reporting of GO 95 infractions. Mr. Chow added that he was contacted by Mr. Kennerly of the NCJPA suggesting NJUNS could be viable for exchanging GO infractions amongst members. Mr. Chow responded to Mr. Kennerly stating that he would present this proposal to the board members at the next meeting. He added if the decision is that NJUNS is a product that would benefit the committee, it would require purchasing a license for the software from the NCJPA. Mr. Chow stated that the tracking function of the software is widely utilized by the NCJPA and other North-Western states. There is a web site that lists those members who are connected to the software and its use. He added that the NCJPA has offered to demonstrate the software for the committee and would open discussion at the next board meeting under unknown items.

Ms. Hernandez inquired if the committee should have members provide their respective forms for GO 95 infraction notification and standardize a form to be utilized by all members.

Ms. Prescott stated that she is receiving notifications in many type of forms.

Mr. Chow suggested taking the list of infractions to be reported compiled from the meeting facilitated by Mr. Stonerock of SCE as a starting place. This item is to remain open for further discussion.

Item 1498: LA County Permits Process/Fees is next on the agenda. This item is to remain open to the end of the year.

Number eight on the agenda is **Item 1504: Arbitration Process**. Ms. Hernandez reported that the proposal of deleting this sub-section from the handbook was on the board meeting agenda last month. Rather than deleting the sub-section, Mr. Wolfe suggested rewording the section to address the process of stopping a disputed JPA from being finalized via the Form 7. She added that this method is utilized today on a case by case situation. In that the re-wording suggestion was raised by Mr. Wolfe, the consensus is to address this issue with Mr. Wolfe is a participant at the meeting.

Topic nine on the agenda is **Item 1508: Clarification of JPC Responsibilities**. Ms. Hernandez reported that the members were to return with their thoughts on the responsibilities of the SCJPC. Ms. Hernandez stated that she has created a first draft, because in her opinion the public should be made aware, via the SCJPC.net site, that the SCJPC is not a governing agency. Mr. Chow added that the committee does not police its members, and this also should be made available to the public via the web page. This issue is to remain open for further discussion.

The tenth assigned topic is **Item 1510: Circuit Identification**. This issue was brought to the table by NextG. Ms. Hernandez stated that this pertains to noting the circuit on the JPA. She inquired if the preliminary JPA notes an incorrect voltage, is it corrected by the power utility? Mr. Pranata interjected that the JPC office has been returning JPAs missing this information. Ms. Hernandez stated that Mr. Chow would determine if the circuit is not transmission, would “L” suffice on a JPA. Mr. Chow responded that “L” is strictly for indentifying secondary. He added that he had discussed this within his organization, but the outcome escapes him at this time.

Mr. Hunter stated that “L” normally means 7500 or less. The JPA noted “L” or “other” for grounding purposes. It is contingent on what communications requires for their grounding.

It was agreed to table this item for further discussion, when NextG is in attendance.

The next assigned issue on the agenda is **Item 1511: Form 44 Process**. This issue was brought to the table by Mr. Bob Wolfe. He stated that the handbook does not direct members how to transact business amongst one another after receiving their respective Form 44’s. She added that some members believe the Form 44 is the invoice or wait to be invoiced or do not invoice.

Therefore, some direction beyond the receipt of the Form 44 could prove beneficial to members. This item is to remain open for further discussion.

Last on the agenda are **miscellaneous items**. The following topics were discussed and reported.

Form 44 over 20 years

Ms. Pranata stated that during the preparation for the relocation, she discovered Form 44's dated back to the 1990 and 1980, she then inquired if they should be retained, scanned or destroyed. It was agreed to destroy them in that they are over 20 years.

Unauthorized on record side of Form 2

Ms. Pranata then reported that per section 4.1, some members are not recording in parenthesis the unauthorized grade and space on the record side of the form 2; they only list it on the proposed portion of the form 2. She inquired if a JPA example should be inserted into section 18. Ms. Hernandez responded that there is a JPA alert addressing this and agrees that an example could help with this issue. She directed Ms. Pranata to accept this type of JPA until January 1, 2011 when it is official that the unauthorized grade and space must be listed on the record portion of the form 2 in parenthesis.

Riser only poles and placing equipment in the support structure.

Ms. Hernandez opened by presenting specific situation. If a riser is the only equipment placed on a pole for the use of the placing member, and the placing member is not joint, therefore requiring the placing member to purchase; in that the riser is attached to the support structure, and not above, she inquired if the attachment grade and space could be noted as 19-1? If the member is not joint, the member must purchase into the pole and could note the grade and space as such.

Ms. Henderson inquired if a member is already joint on the pole, is paperwork required to attach to the support structure? After discussion it was agreed that if a member is a joint owner they are allowed to attach on the support structure without paperwork.

AC 5-C and 19

Mr. Hunter opened discussion on AC 5-C and why it should be a shared cost on a cut and kick. Ms. Hernandez stated that in her tenure of processing JPAs, the reason for not sharing the cost of 5-C is the pole is topped for the benefit of power only. She added that per Mr. Wayne Brown of SCE, they do not charge 5-C.

Mr. Chow stated that he has questioned this issue as well. Mr. Hunter stated that in his opinion the cut and kick is beneficial to all parties. He added that his organization invokes 5-C with a set alongside pole as well for the same reasoning.

Ms. Hernandez stated that she believed that 5-C is included in AC 19 which is a large expense.

Mr. Chow suggested that some costs could be blended into one. If 5-C were to be included in 19, then when invoking 19 there should never be 5-C. Ms. Hernandez remarked that this is what she was informed when she was originally trained. However, she added that there is no documentation stating that 5-C is included in 19. The process of SCE not charging 5-C has a long history and it is difficult to determine when the process began and when the agreement was reached.

Mr. Hunter stated that 95% of JPAs initiated by his organization where 5-C is invoked have been accepted, therefore, an agreement must be reached on whether to invoke or not invoke 5-C with 19.

The members agreed that some costs could be blended into other costs in that work practices have changed over time.

It was agreed that historical minutes would be reviewed for sections 5-C and section 19. When the minutes are reviewed, discussion can begin on blending costs into other costs such as 5-C into 19.

Allocation of SCZ

Mr. Chow opened discussion on allocation of the safety clearance zone. He stated an example of a JPA where com was 24-6 and power 39-13 on a 45 foot pole but a com tenant desired to attach at 25 feet, is paperwork required? Ms. Hernandez stated that her understanding is that the SCZ starts at the highest com up six feet regardless of where power is attached. Mr. Chow stated that he understood from his tenure with Verizon that the SCZ starts at the lowest power down. He added that per GO the six feet of SCZ must be from power down.

Ms. Hernandez stated that space is allocated from the top down. She added that a JPA is required and initiated in that the records are updated and the space allocated correctly although no monies are exchanged. In Mr. Chow's scenario, the SCZ would start at the SCE com tenant six feet up.

The review of actions items are as follows:

- LAC, SPR and ATT will work on the process after a Form 44 is received.
- Ms. Corella and Ms. Pranata to research historical minutes for sections 5-C and 19.
- Mr. Chow to contact Mr. Stonerock to schedule a meeting to discuss inspection infraction reporting between members.
- Example for section 4.1 data in parenthesis on record side of Form 2

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m. until September, 2010.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE
1400 Montefino Ave., Suite 100
Diamond Bar, CA 91765
Phone (909) 348-5920

October 12, 2010

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 9:00 am. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. James Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Mr. Dennis Ennis – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Serv/AT&T Comm
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Charles Johnson – Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Douglas Kearney - ATC-Outdoor DAS (teleconference)
Mr. Ron Boyer – Time Warner Cable (teleconference)
Ms. Maryan Farajzadeh - City of Vernon (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Mr. Kyle Levy – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by addressing the actions items from the previous meeting. The first action item is documenting the process to follow after members receive their respective monthly Form 44's. LAC, SPR and ATT were assigned this action item. Mr. Hernandez reported that the group were unable to meet and added that this issue be tabled for the next meeting. Next, Ms. Corella and Ms. Pranata were to research historical minutes pertaining to sections 5-C and 19. Mr. Chow was to contact Mr. Stonerock to schedule a meeting to discuss inspection infraction reporting between members. Lastly, the ad hoc was to create an example for section 4.1 data in parenthesis on record side of Form 2 also for purchasing interest for riser only or equipment in the support structure. Ms. Hernandez inquired if any members have questions or concerns in regards to the prior meeting minutes. There were no questions or concerns in regards to the prior meeting minutes.

Ms. Hernandez then began addressing the agenda items. First item addressed is **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. She stated that this is a standing item. There were no comments or questions. This item is to remain open.

The third issue on the agenda is Item **1472: Pole Replacement Requirement**. Ms. Hernandez inquired of Mr. Eastwood on the status of the proposed meeting to discuss SCE pole replacement requirements.

Mr. Eastwood reported that he is attempting to research back to the CPUC proceedings and OII to determine what prompted SCE to implement the current pole replacement process. He added that he believes this transpired sometime in the mid-nineties. He further added if any members

recollect OII discussions regarding this issue to contact him. He would like to determine how, when and why this process was prompted and implemented by SCE.

This concern was prompted by communication in that the process of SCE not allowing anyone to replace poles where they are base owners and/or poles with their equipment is hindering and delaying communication member transactions by waiting for SCE to replace poles.

Mr. Eastwood stated until he is able to determine and understand the driver behind the SCE pole replacement process can he approach those within SCE to attempt to remedy the problem. He added that he would continue to research and he is sympathetic toward communication in that this process hinders completion of their business transactions.

After extensive discussion, this item is to remain open while Mr. Eastwood continues to research and attempt to coordinate a meeting for members with SCE personnel.

The next topic for discussion is **Item 1495: Pole Inspections**. Mr. Chow reported that Mr. Stonerock is out of town; however, he proposes scheduling a meeting for the members with Mr. Stonerock to address pole inspection reporting and forms. He added that what the members should agree upon is what infractions are to be considered reportable. He further added that his organization is receiving notices on items that are not infractions, and members are reporting anything that requires minor repairing. After discussion, it was agreed to schedule a meeting the following week after the Board and Operating meetings to discuss the above-mentioned issues.

Item 1498: LA County Permits Process/Fees is next on the agenda. This item is to remain open to the end of the year.

Number six on the agenda is **Item 1504: Arbitration Process**. Ms. Hernandez reported that it has been agreed to remove the reference to arbitration from Section 18.1-B (d). However; Mr. Wolfe suggested retaining the section and revise it to address the stopping of a disputed JPA from being finalized via a Form 7. Ms. Hernandez added that this process is currently in effect today. She further added that she is not clear on how Mr. Wolfe's suggestion differs from what is currently in place; therefore this item is to remain open.

Topic nine on the agenda is **Item 1508: Clarification of JPC Responsibilities**. Ms. Hernandez stated that this pertains to publishing a document on the SCJPC web site that the committee is not a governing agency. She added that she did not find the time to concentrate on this issue. This item is to remain open.

The tenth assigned topic is **Item 1510: Circuit Identification**. This pertains to noting the circuit on the Form 2. Ms. Hernandez inquired if Mr. Chow has researched within his organization to determine if "L" is an acceptable identifier. Mr. Chow responded that he inquired, but has not received a response. He added that he would follow up on this item.

Mr. Eastwood stated that he informed SCE staff that the circuit must be identified on the Form 2 prior to finalization. Ms. Hernandez responded that she believes she is receiving forms with the circuit noted on the form. This item is to remain open.

The next assigned issue on the agenda is **Item 1511: Form 44 Process**. This issue concerns the process for members to follow after receiving the monthly Form 44 and the net due payment terms. Mr. Chow stated that the Routine does not direct members in regards to invoicing and remitting payment after the Form 44's are received by the respective members.

Ms. Hernandez stated that in her opinion, this concern is not a Routine issue but an accounting issue contingent on member's accounting departments. After brief discussion it was agreed to table this item for the next meeting.

The last assigned agenda item is **Item 1514: Form 48 Final bill Timeframe**. This issue was brought to the table by Mr. Wolfe of AT&T California. Mr. Chow stated in that AT&T California is in the process of clearing their backlog, and what triggers the action to PTD on their part is the receipt of the Form 48. In regards to SCE and AT & T California, the latter contacts the former for a Form 48 pertaining to a specific JPA. What SCE discovers is that the specific JPA is years old and the Form 48 has been sent over a year ago. The second JPA is sent with a recent date, but in the interim the JPA has been finalized. However, he added that both parties are working on correcting this issue. When the second Form 48 is sent, SCE stamps it as a copy. Mr. Chow added that he is not certain what Mr. Wolfe desires to address further on this issue. This item is to remain open.

Last on the agenda are **miscellaneous items**. The following topics were discussed and reported.

Crown Castle/NewPath Networks

Mr. Chow stated that his office received notice that Crown Castle has acquired NewPath Networks. Ms. Hernandez stated that there is a letter in the Administrative Board packet referring to the acquisition which is to be discussed at the next Board meeting.

Blank pages in JPA

Ms. Haney questioned when a final JPA is revised and condensed resulting in blank pages, should the revised copy include the blank pages to correspond with the original? The JPC office questioned NextG about the blank pages. She is not certain which method the members would prefer. Ms. Hernandez responded that the final could be condensed and should not include blank pages. The consensus is to delete blank pages.

License-Lease Process

Mr. Chow opened discussion on license-lease process. He stated that all members in the committee, who have chosen to partake in joint ownership, should have a license-lease process in place. He added that SCE has an instance when a tenant desired to lease space owned by a fellow member, the tenant was informed that they (the owning party) does not have a license-lease process to lease the space to the tenant. This created a problem for SCE. He further added that in his opinion, if utilities agree to partake in joint pole ownership, they should be prepared to handle full responsibilities of joint ownership and in his opinion having a license-lease process is one factor.

Ms. Prescott stated that in some instances they have given tenants a free-attachment. It was agreed that there is no need to place verbiage into the Routine in regards to this issue.

P-Comm Clearance

Ms. Hernandez questioned what is the required clearance between power secondary and their communications? Mr. Chow responded that there is an exception for clearance between power and communications if it is owned by the power utility. He added that it is something less than the required 6 feet in other instances. The members briefly discussed this issue. Mr. Chow added that he would research and return with the answer to the question of P-comm clearance.

JPA Examples

Lastly, the members discussed and reviewed new JPA example diagrams for 1) *Ex. 17* - unauthorized attachments, and 2) *Ex. 18* - purchasing for riser or equipment in support structure. The examples will be inserted into the Routine Handbook for reference effective January 2011. In the interim, there will be a JPA alert displaying the aforementioned examples.

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m. until November 9, 2010.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE
1400 Montefino Ave., Suite 100
Diamond Bar, CA 91765
Phone (909) 348-5920

November 9, 2010

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 10:30 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. James Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks (teleconference)
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Serv/AT&T Comm
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by reviewing the minutes from the previous meeting. There were no questions or concerns regards the prior meeting minutes.

Ms. Hernandez then addressed the first agenda item, **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. She stated that this is a standing item. There were no comments or questions. This item is to remain open.

The third issue on the agenda is Item **1472: Pole Replacement Requirement**. Ms. Hernandez reported that Mr. Eastwood stated earlier that if any members are aware of any past OII meetings that might have prompted SCE to initiate the current SCE pole replacement policy, to please provide him with the information. Ms. Prescott stated that she has past emails that she would forward to Mr. Eastwood to aid in determining what prompted the SCE policy.

Ms. Hernandez suggested reviewing past minutes. Mr. Eastwood stated that he would arrange time to visit the JPC office to review the past hard document minutes. Ms. Corella asked Mr. Eastwood to contact her with the day he plans on visiting the JPC office and she would have the hard copies ready.

The next topic for discussion is Item **1495: Pole Inspections**. Ms. Hernandez stated that bullet one should be removed in that it has been addressed by this ad hoc committee. The resource document is available on the SCJPC.net web site. The consensus is that this item number should be transferred to the Pole Loading/Inspections ad hoc committee. This item is no longer assigned to this ad hoc committee.

Item 1498: LA County Permits Process/Fees is next on the agenda. This item is to remain open to the end of the year.

Number six on the agenda is **Item 1504: Arbitration Process**. Ms. Hernandez reported that Mr. Wolfe suggested revising the section alluding to arbitration by documenting that a Form 7 could

be utilized to stop a Form 2 from being finalized. Ms. Hernandez added that this process is currently in place, if this is what Mr. Wolfe is implying. She is aware that the NCJPA uses the Form 7 for disputes, but she added that if the SCJPC implements the NCJPA process it would create a mass of paperwork. In that she is not certain which direction Mr. Wolfe would like to take this, this item would remain open until Mr. Wolfe is present.

Topic seven on the agenda is **Item 1508: Clarification of JPC Responsibilities**. Ms. Hernandez proposed tabling this issue for the next meeting in that she was unable to devote the time necessary to this issue. This item is to remain open.

The eighth assigned topic is **Item 1510: Circuit Identification**. This pertains to noting the correct circuit on the Form 2. Mr. Eastwood reported that internally, per the training department within his organization, anything under 5,000 is considered low (L) voltage. The training department is instructing their planners that if there is an upgrade, it must be noted on the JPA so the pole card is updated for the benefit of all owners. Also, if there is only an upgrade, a JPA must be sent to all owners on record. He concluded by stating that hopefully, this should address this concern, and that SCE is willing to cooperate in the spirit of the committee.

Ms. Hernandez added that when a foreign JPA is issued to SCE, the majority of the time, the initiator is guessing the voltage. If the voltage is not upgraded, where necessary, the JPC office is not aware of the upgrade and the pole card is not corrected.

Ms. Hernandez inquired of Ms. Haney if the solution presented by Mr. Eastwood to this issue of circuit identifier is satisfactory. After brief discussion, Ms. Haney stated that she is in agreement with the solution. Ms. Hernandez stated that this item is now closed.

The next assigned issue on the agenda is **Item 1511: Form 44 Process**. This issue concerns the process for members to follow after receiving the monthly Form 44 and the net due payment terms. She reported that she would have some documentation ready for next meeting.

The last assigned agenda item is **Item 1514: Form 48 Final bill Timeframe**. This issue was brought to the table by Mr. Wolfe of AT&T California. Ms. Hernandez stated that she would like to table this issue until Mr. Wolfe could be present.

Last on the agenda are **miscellaneous items**. The following topics were discussed and reported.

Section 5.1-B – Renumbering Relinquished Poles – JPC office

Ms. Pranata opened discussion by presenting a situation where a base owner relinquishes interest to another owner, and the remaining owner fails to renumber the pole, but all other owners have agreed and signed the Form 2. Should the JPC process the Form 2 with the old pole number, since the receiving member did not renumber the pole? Normally, the JPC office returns the form; however, this situation arose where the City of Lompoc would not renumber the pole and stated that all members' party to the JPA agreed, therefore, the Form 2 should be processed. She added that the relinquishing party in this situation is PG&E, who no longer is a member of the SCJPC.

The members reviewed the section for clarification. Ms. Hernandez stated that her interpretation of the section is that the senior equity owner is to be the base owner, unless another member volunteers to be base owner. The agreement reference in the section refers to another member, not the senior member, agreeing to become base owner, and all other members agree to allow that other joint owner to be base owner. Whoever becomes base owner is required to renumber the pole. Thus, pole numbering is a requirement in this section.

Mr. Hunter stated that if his organization is the relinquishing party, they do not want their pole number to remain with the pole due to the legality of it and the liability. Another remaining owner would be required to renumber the pole, regardless of who that is.

After discussion it was agreed to revise the section for clarification. The revision is to be on the Discussion calendar of the next board meeting for possible approval.

Form 48 Changes – DWP

Mr. Hunter proposed a change to the Form 48 in regards to hand dig. He suggested a check box with a blank line for hand dig, poles and anchors. He added that the issue within his organization is if this were noted on the Form 48 it would prompt DWP personnel to check the box and fill in the pole or the anchor. He further suggested a spot to place the pole number that required hand dig in that in some instances there is only one pole that required hand dig and not all the poles.

After extensive discussion, it was agreed to revise and simplify the form. **Item 1516: Form 48 Revision** has been assigned to this ad hoc.

Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts.

- Place on discussion Section 5.1-B revision.
- Item 1516: Form 48 Revision for simplification assigned to this ad hoc
- Mr. Eastwood to review past minutes to determine prompting of SCE pole replacement program.
- Remove Item 1495 to Pole Loading ad hoc committee.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m. until January, 2011.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations