

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

January 11, 2011

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 2:15 p.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. James Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California
Mr. Jeff Wolf – AT&T California
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
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
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by stating that due to the lack of time, she would like to concentrate on reviewing all the prior year's approved revisions with the ad hoc members. Unless there is an urgency to address and discuss any agenda item, Ms. Hernandez added that she would prefer to table the entire agenda at this time. It was agreed to table the agenda for the following meeting.

The first revision discussed is Section 15.6. Ms. Hernandez stated that she was of the opinion that it was agreed to remove the chart associated with this section. Ms. Pranata responded that according to her revision notations, this chart was to be removed effective January 2011. Section 15.6 would now read, "Pole class on new pole set is required". The members discussed minimum class pole and the scenarios of different pole classes. Mr. Ennis stated that by maintaining the minimum pole class chart, it would serve as a good tool for incoming members and any members with questions in regards to minimum pole class.

Ms. Prescott proposed reviewing the minimum pole class chart annually for accuracy. She added that this chart has not been revised in recent years. She suggested having the chart reviewed every X number of years. After brief discussion, it was agreed to send the chart to the power utility members for review and revision to the chart if necessary. The chart is to be included in the annual pole price matrix that is sent to members via the authorized cost ad hoc committee.

Next discussed is the addition of another alternative to wood pole. The City of Los Angeles would like to differentiate between their single piece composite fiberglass poles and their multiple piece composite fiberglass poles. It was agreed to create "CM" for composite fiberglass pole multiple piece.

Next, Ms. Hernandez stated that in regards to unauthorized, Section 4.1 was revised, but Sections 7.7 and 5.4 which also allude to unauthorized have not been addressed. She inquired if the

2-tier penalty of 4.1-A and 4.1-B should apply to these two sections as well. It was agreed that this process should apply to the aforementioned sections.

Mr. Wolfe stated that these sections should not be changed in that the pole(s) would no longer be in service. He added that he would find it difficult to support having to pay a greater penalty for the pole being removed and a cost for the new pole as well. He added that this issue would require more thought on his part. Ms. Hernandez stated that the unauthorized member has been attached unauthorized for a great number of years, and should pay for the pole that is being removed.

It is agreed that these sections cannot stand alone and are in conjunction with 4.1-A or B. This item would be discussed further.

Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts.

- No actions items

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m. until February, 2011.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

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

February 8, 2011

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. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. James Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Jeff Wolf – AT&T California
Mr. Chuck Johnson – Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel (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
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by **reviewing the prior months meeting minutes**. In regards to updating the current minimum pole class requirements chart in section 15.7, Ms. Hernandez inquired if Ms. Corella received any responses from the power utilities about their minimum pole class requirements. Ms. Corella responded that she received 3 responses. Ms. Hernandez instructed Ms. Corella to update the chart with the responses and submit for publication into the handbook. There were no further comments on the prior months meeting minutes.

The next item on the agenda is **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. There were no comments or concerns on this agenda item.

The third issue on the agenda is **Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement**. This issue concerns the SCE policy of not allowing other members to replace SCE poles. Mr. Eastwood stated that he has nothing to report at this meeting.

The next issue for discussion is **Item 1504: Arbitration Process**. Ms. Hernandez reported that the verbiage, “arbitration” has been removed from the Routine Handbook. However, Mr. Wolfe suggested rather than deleting the entire section with the verbiage, revise the section to address the method of stopping a disputed JPA via a Form 7. Ms. Hernandez stated that the Form 7 notification for disputing a JPA is currently in process. A Form 7 is sent to all parties involved in the JPA, not to final a specific JPA until the dispute is resolved, and a carbon copy is sent to the JPC office. It was agreed to close this item.

The fifth issue on the agenda is **Item 1508: Clarification of JPC Responsibilities**. Ms. Hernandez reported that she and Mr. Chow were to collaborate on creating a document describing the duties and responsibilities of the SCJPC. She added that the purpose for the document is to convey

that it is not the responsibility of the SCJPC to ensure that all members comply with GO regulations and that the SCJPC is not a policing organization. She further added that she and Mr. Chow were unable to coordinate their calendars.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1511: Form 44 Process**. Ms. Hernandez reported that Mr. Wolfe has suggested that the Routine Handbook should notate the Form 44 process beyond the point of a member receiving the forms. In short, what is the next step for members when they receive the Form 44's in their respective organizations. Ms. Hernandez has created documents to address this issue (see Attachment). The members reviewed the documents. Ms. Hernandez stated that in her opinion, the time frame for invoicing and expected remittance is up to the members individual accounting systems and should not be dictated via the handbook. She added that she understands Mr. Wolfe's concern with the accounting methods of fellow members, but this should not be a part of the Routine in her opinion.

The members discussed the capabilities of the current software versus the accounting systems within their respective organizations. The members reviewed and Section 18.6 and agreed to insert the verbiage from the document created by Ms. Hernandez into this section. After discussion and revisions to the section, it was agreed to place this item with the proposed revisions to Section 18.6 on the Discussion calendar of the next Board meeting.

The seventh issue on the agenda is **Item 1514: Form 48 Final Timeframe**. In that Mr. Wolfe was not in attendance at this time, it was agreed to table this for the next meeting.

The next issue is **Item 1516: Form 48 Simplification**. This was brought to the table by DWP. It was agreed to table this until a time when DWP is present.

The ninth issue for discussion is **Item 1518: Hardscape Landscape Restoration**. This item is also on the Authorized Costs agenda; therefore, this issue is contingent on the outcome of the Authorized Costs Elements ad hoc committee.

Lastly, the members discussed the bulleted items under miscellaneous.

45 Day limit Change/Denial

The first miscellaneous issue discussed is the denial of a JPA change after it is approved. Ms. Smith stated that when the 45 day has lapsed, construction can begin, but this does not stop any JPA negotiations. Ms. Hernandez stressed that if a JPA change or Form 7 is denied, it should not be solely based on the mere fact that the time limit has elapsed, but a valid construction/engineering reason. After extensive discussion it was agreed that a JPA alert would be published to read, "*It is possible to make changes to a Form 2 JPA or issue Form 7 after the JPA is approved (signed or by automatic approval). Denial of JPA changes or Form 7 based solely on time limits is not a valid reason for denial.*"

Members Inspection Schedules

The question is how often a member can bill for pole inspections. Is there a time range when a pole is inspected? Ms. Hernandez stated that there is a difference in opinion of the time cycles for pole inspections. Mr. Chow stated that if there is a difference, perhaps an agreed upon cycle could be decided, and this should return to GO 165 based cycles. After discussion it was agreed to contact those members that have an approved inspection program for their inspection cycles. This issue will remain open for further discussion.

Maximum Space for Clearance/Interset Pole

Ms. Pranata questioned if space for clearance should only be one foot. Ms. Hernandez responded one foot per attachment. It was noted that the JPA should read one foot clearance for each attachment, and not space down grade. It should not be recorded space and grade, but each attachment should not their respective space. After extension discussion, it was agreed to place a JPA Alert demonstrating how to notate clearance, free and tenant attachments correctly on JPAs. The alert is as follows:

Members must specify the grade of clearance attachment(s), free attachments, and tenants.

Clearance Attachment Example:

CLR23

CLR22

CLR21

Incorrect:

CLEAR 23-3

TN23

(Utility with clearance attachment(s) should not have a tenant)

Free Attachment Example:

FA22

(Only 1 foot allowed for each Member)

Tenant Example:

TN22 or T22

Sections 4.3 & 4.0 specifically for owner buying into safety-clear or entire pole?

Ms. Pranata presented a situation of a JPA going from 2 to 3 members. She added that the member in the safety clearance area is not the initiating member, but another party on the JPA, therefore, the pole is rearranged. She questioned if section 4.3 should be invoked or merely 4.0. Mr. Wolfe responded that the member that is rearranging and placing the third member into safety clearance has to purchase the safety clearance space. The consensus is to use 4.3 for that member that decides to purchase into the safety clearance zone.

Sharing Arm on Grade

Ms. Pranata inquired if 3 members share a grade and an arm is attached, can only two members be attached to the arm? The response is that the grade could have an arm with two attachments and the other third member attached to the pole within same grade. This scenario is acceptable.

Ms. Pranata stated that some JPAs are noted as 23.3. She inquired what the decimal represents. Mr. Chow responded that that attachment is at 23 and .3 of a foot. He stated that the SCE older system would notate tenth of a foot. Mr. Chow stated that he would ensure that this is no longer noted on SCE JPAs. However, he added if this type notation does appear on SCE JPAs the JPC office should round up.

Sales Tax on Salvage

Ms. Pranata stated that currently the Routine does not mention when sales tax is applicable. She added that this question was posed to her from an SCE employee. Mr. Chow stated that sale tax applies when a pole has salvage value. He added that the previous supervisor, Ms. Baccus had a sales scale that she utilized. After brief discussion it was agreed to contact the committee accountant with this question.

Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts.

- Ms. Corella to contact members with approved maintenance for their inspection cycle.
- Ms. Corella to contact committee accountant in regards to sales tax on salvage poles.
- Ms. Pranata to upload JPA Alert in regards to JPA change/denial after 45 day limit.
- Ms. Pranata to upload JPA Alert in regards to correct method of noting clearance attachments.
-

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m. until March, 2011.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

Attachment

Form 44

SCJPC balances each account of the Final Bills processed during the month.
Account Codes are listed on page....

SCJPC produces a Form 44 for each account.

(Insert a Form 44 with explanation of the form)

The second page lists the JPA processed for that account.

JPC sends the Form 44(s) to each member involved.

- The member due money, must issue an invoice for remittance.
 - Attached signed Form 44 with the invoice
- The member owing money waits for the invoice from the other member.
 - Attach signed Form 44 with remittance

Associated with the Form 44 are the final bills processed during that month.
Each member should review the Final Bills for accuracy.

If correction(s) is/are required:

- Contact the initiating member and request a correction of records.
- If you are the initiating member, issue a correction of records.
- If the correction is required due to JPC, request JPC to issue a correction of records.

Form 44 must be invoiced as received, even if a correction is required.

When the correction of records is processed, the monies will be rectified.

As a member of the SCJPC, you are responsible for invoicing/payment of all Form 44s.

JPC PRODUCTIONS

Date: 11/29/2010
Page: Page 1 of 2
Period: 11/14/2010
Account: 833

BILL OF SALE - FORM 44

AND

ACKNOWLEDGE OF TITLE

UNDER JOINT POLE AGREEMENT DATED JANUARY 1, 1998

BETWEEN

XO Communications

AND

Verizon Wireless

NET AMOUNT DUE: Verizon Wireless \$491.00

Above utilities hereby transfer to each other the interests and/or render an accounting for labor performed and/or materials supplied or salvaged as detailed in the attached joint pole authorizations, made a part hereof. Sales are made subject to mortgages, deeds of trust or other prior liens upon property specified therein.


APPROVED CORRECT :

EXECUTED FOR:

XO Communications

BY:

APPROVED CORRECT :


Luis Hernandez

EXECUTED FOR:

Verizon Wireless

BY:

BILL OF SALE - FORM 44

AUTHORIZATION NUMBER

- ✓ ~~NXT-17089-03~~
- ✓ ~~NXT-17089-04~~
- ✓ ~~NXT-17089-07~~
- ✓ ~~NXT-17089-08~~

Due - NXT

Due - ATC

0.00	292.00 ✓
0.00	160.00 ✓
0.00	30.00 ✓
0.00	9.00 ✓

Column Totals For This Account

JPA(s): 4

\$0.00

\$491.00

End of Report (11/29/2010 8:43:53AM)

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

March 8, 2011

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 10:50 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
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Jeff Wolf – AT&T California
Mr. Chuck Johnson – Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel (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. Dennis Ennis – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by **reviewing the prior months meeting minutes**. There were no questions or comments on the minutes. Mr. Wolfe announced that Ms. Pranata has published the 2011 Routine and Authorized Costs Handbook on the SCJPC.net website.

Mr. Wolfe than shared with the members that he is participating in a GO 95 rules committee and it is addressing workspace in the C-class zone. They are attempting to extrapolate what constitutes workspace in and around phone cable drops and equipment. He added that he does not agree with the 24 inch requirement for cable and would report this back to the committee. However, he concluded that his desire is to share with the members that there is a rules committee working on redefining workspace in the communication zone.

The next item on the agenda is **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. Ms. Hernandez refreshed the members on this issue. She reported that this pertains to members submitting outstanding foreign JPAs to one another to aid in finalizing any outstanding JPAs. Mr. Wolfe stated that the only member sending his organization a list is SCE. He added that his organization attempts to expedite the JPA process as quickly as possible. There were no further comments or concerns on this agenda item.

The third issue on the agenda is **Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement**. This issue concerns the SCE policy of not allowing other members to replace SCE poles or poles with SCE equipment. Mr. Eastwood stated that he continues to work on this issue.

The fifth issue on the agenda is **Item 1508: Clarification of JPC Responsibilities**. Ms. Hernandez stated that she brought this issue to the table, and is not certain if this issue is still necessary. She added that the CPSD is under the assumption that it is the responsibility of the committee to ensure that all members are in compliance with GO 95. She added that the SCJPC is not a governing agency or in practice to police one another. It is incumbent on every member to abide by GO 95. The members discussed revising the mission statement published on the SCJPC.net home page to allude to the primary functions of the SCJPC. The members reviewed the mission statement. After brief discussion, it was agreed that Ms. Hernandez and Ms. Prescott would coordinate revising the mission statement and return next month with their proposed revision. This item is to remain open.

The sixth issue on the agenda is **Item 1514: Form 48 Final Timeframe**. Ms. Hernandez stated that if all members' party to a JPA has signed their approval, and there are no changes, the JPA can be finalized the same time the Form 48 is issued. Mr. Wolfe responded that in instances, a field trip reveals that what is on the JPA has not transpired in the field. Mr. Wolfe stated that he has concern with the last sentence in paragraph one of Section 18.2. Ms. Hernandez inquired if a JPA has been signed as approved by all those members party to a JPA, the initiating party must wait the full 45 days before finalizing the JPA. Mr. Wolfe responded that the other members would need to field the pole. After extensive discussion it was agreed to delete the above mentioned sentence and add verbiage that there is exception to pole damage (see attachment I). This exception would also apply to correction of record.

Mr. Chow noted that many examples in section 18 are not consistent with their referenced sections. The members reviewed example 17 and questioned notation (6). After discussion it was agreed to cross reference the entire RH and word search for "Form 48" to ensure that the reference is correct and consistent.

Ms. Pranata questioned section 4.1-B. She inquired if the penalty would be based on the date sent. Mr. Wolfe responded that the penalty would be based on the date sent.

The next issue is **Item 1516: Form 48 Simplification**. Mr. Walls presented a proposed revised draft of the Form 48 for simplification. Mr. Walls stated that this is a first draft and is ready to be reviewed, discussed and further revised within the ad hoc. The ad hoc will discuss this further at the next meeting. This item is to remain open.

Next is **Item 1518: Hard-Scape-Landscape Restoration**. The members agreed it is near impossible to assign a specified dollar amount as an authorized cost to this item. Therefore, verbiage is proposed for AC 13 (see attachment II). This revision to AC 13 will be on the discussion calendar of the next board meeting.

Item 1518: Alternative Pole Costs when Cost not submitted was discussed next. Mr. Hunter stated that when an alternative to wood pole cost is not submitted for a specific year, that the default cost should be that of the last alternative to wood cost submitted, and not the current wood pole cost. In essence, the cost should revert/default back, however long ago the alternative cost was submitted by that specific member.

Ms. Hernandez stated that it is incumbent on the member to have stated on their proposed pole prices to revert to last submitted alternative to wood cost. The directive is to revert back to the last year that specific member submitted alternative to wood cost rather than defaulting to the current wood pole cost. Mr. Walls proposed the following statement, *"For any alternative pole cost installed without a current year cost submitted, please revert to last submitted cost for that type and*

size of pole. It is agreed and noted in this Routine Revision ad hoc committee meeting minutes. This item is now closed.

Lastly, the members discussed the bulleted items under miscellaneous.

Pole Inspection Cycles

Ms. Corella distributed a list with the inspection cycles of those members who have an approved maintenance program in section 2.7. The objective is to determine how often members are allowed to bill for inspections within a specified time frame. The members discussed the various types of inspections. After further extensive discussion the members agreed on the following statement: *Item 12 may be billed no more than one time in a 5 year period* (see attachment III). Originally, the thought was to place this item on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting. However, after second thought, it was agreed to continue this discussion into the next ad hoc committee meeting. **Item 1522: Pole Inspection Cycles** has been assigned to this ad hoc committee.

The members briefly discussed publishing tags on the SCJPC.net web site. Currently, some member's cable tags are available to view on the web site. The members agreed to discuss pole tags further.

Sales Tax on Salvage

Next, the members discussed the need of applying sales tax to salvage poles. Ms. Corella stated that she contacted Mr. Hunt, the committee accountant and documented his response. She then read the documented response to the members (see attachment IV). Mr. Corella stated that if it is decided to eliminate sales tax it should be noted in the RH should any member have a question. It was agreed that since nothing alludes to sales tax in the RH today, there is no need to add such verbiage. In the event that the JPC office is questioned, the response would be there is no sales tax applied since there is no mention of it in the RH. It is noted in these Routine Revision ad hoc committee minutes that effective per the April 2011 billing cycle, there is no more sales tax applied to salvage poles. It is so agreed upon and noted today.

Correction of Records JPA standardization and clarification

Ms. Pranata reported that the JPC office has been receiving much correction of records JPAs. She added that there is no consistency in the method of preparation by members. She further added that when members are referred to the example (example 8) in section 18, the text does not correlate to the example in the RH. For example Ms. Pranata stated that the text does not state that the dates should be the same as the original or the JPA number should be the same original number with the COR extension. Ms. Hernandez stated that when a correction is made the JPC office must have the original dates since the correction is per what was submitted originally, since cost et al must reflect original cost of the date of issue. Ms. Pranata responded that the office is receiving correction of record JPAs with new dates and that the example reflects such, but the text does not state. Ms. Hernandez stated that the first sentence does imply that the correction date should be the original date of the erroneous JPA. She added that the text is to explain what any specific section is about and how and why it is used. The example is a visual aid.

Ms. Pranata inquired if the office receives a correction, should the staff change the date or return it to the initiator to correct the date(s). The consensus is to return it and refer to the specific example.

It was agreed to place a JPA alert on this topic. It was noted that SCE is unable to reuse JPA numbers, but if need be could reference correction JPA with number and date on new JPA. In Example 8 (3), it was agreed to add the verbiage, "whenever possible". Ms. Pranata will place a JPA alert in regards to this issue.

Is the size of existing PTX required on Sec 4.0 or other maintenance sections?

Ms. Hernandez responded that if the PTX size is available on an existing, to notate it, however, not necessary if it is not readily available. PTX size is required if it is a new extension.

Safety Clearance between Power

Ms. Pranata inquired about no safety clearance between M and E, and if this situation is acceptable. Ms. Hernandez responded no need in that both members are power. In the example provided by Ms. Pranata, there is an E guy above communications, and since the guy is owned by power, but no power there is no need for safety clearance.

Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts.

- Ms. Pranata to word-search the RH for "Form 48" verbiage.
- Sales tax on salvage poles will no longer be issued and JPA form 2 will have tax column removed.
- Ms. Corella to provide Mr. Eastwood the SCE MSDS to provide detailed descriptions of AC item 12 A-D.
- Ms. Hernandez and Ms. Prescott to review the mission statement on the SCJPC.net home page to revise for clarification of responsibilities.
- Ms. Pranata to place on JPA alerts for alternative to wood billing, correction or records and no more sales tax issued.
- Revision to Section 18.2 to be placed on discussion calendar of next board meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m. until March, 2011.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

Attachment I

18.2 Form 2 Final - Initiation

The Member initiating transaction shall transmit one copy of this form, which shall be an original Southern California Joint Pole Committee authorized typed or electronic document, to Joint Pole Committee, specifying work as completed under approved Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization not less than 45 and no more than 90 calendar days after sending the completed Form 48. After 90 days 18.1F may apply. *Exception section 7.6 can be final billed less than 45 days (Revised January 2012).*

All data essential to complete the record must be specified, including Member accounting data, voltage and space shown on Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization.

NOTE: If the above information cannot be obtained by the issuing Member, the Committee office is authorized to obtain said information from the non-issuing Member.

Transfer, Installation, equipment, and other authorized costs must be shown by item number and number of items.

The date sent on the Form 2 Final will always be the same as the date sent on the Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization. (Revised July 2009)

Attachment II

ITEM

13. Pole access obstructions:

(c) All other by Special Agreement Section 1.2 **such as landscape/hardscape restoration written estimate required. (Discussion Admin Board).**

ATTACHMENT III
Inspection Cycles March 2011

Members with Approved
Maintenance programs in
Section 2

E M MP J MA D SCW

Intrusive

Re-inspection of fiberglass wrapped or reinforced poles (ctruss/ steel stub)

Item 12 may be billed no more than one time in a 5 year period.

***The City of Azusa has completed the maintenance inspection program on the entire inventory of poles.**

The next scheduled cycle for inspection will begin in 2016, and will be completed in 2018.

****We follow the CPUC GO 165 Reg's for system patrols and inspections, in our case we do a detailed inspection every 55 working days and a drive by inspection every 22 working days. We are currently looking at a complete system pole testing program to speed up our current pole status**

Attachment IV

Pole Salvage Sales Tax

In speaking with Mr. Robert Hunt, the committee accountant, he questioned if the pole being salvaged was purchased from a vendor and sales tax paid. If purchased out of state than use tax reported. It appears to him that since the members were all owners on the pole a sale has not been made and nothing changed hands, but a salvage fee paid and this does not constitute a sale, therefore, no need to include sales tax. If members are receiving sales tax he inquired as to how they are treating the sales tax and if they are reporting it to the state of California. It appears to him that this transaction is not a sale in the true sense so there might not be a need to include sales tax, but he added that he would not want to deny any member of 8% revenue.

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

April 12, 2011

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 9:55 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
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Steve Garcia – ExteNet Systems, LLC (teleconference)
Mr. Chuck Johnson – Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility (teleconference)
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Serv/AT&T Comm
Mr. Dennis Ennis – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by **reviewing the prior months meeting minutes**. She gave a briefing of the prior meeting minutes. She reported that the issue of inspection cycles would be discussed later in the meeting. There were no questions or comments on the minutes.

The next item on the agenda is **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. Ms. Hernandez stated that this is a standing agenda item. There were no questions or concerns on this issue.

The third issue on the agenda is **Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement**. This issue concerns the SCE policy of not allowing other members to replace SCE poles or poles with SCE equipment. Mr. Eastwood stated that there continues to be discussion within his organization, but no action at this time. Ms. Hernandez proposed perhaps handling these scenarios on a case by case situation until there is some resolution to this issue. She added that this item has been open since 2008 and since then, there has not been much activity. She further added that it appears that the case by case handling of this issue is successful. Ms. Haney responded that this is not working and/or is it successful. She added that SCE does not allow NG to replace poles even when engaging the same contractors that SCE utilizes. Mr. Chow responded that this statement is correct, however, the driver behind this decision is that the mutual contractor would be engaged by the other member and not engaged by SCE.

After discussion amongst the members, it was agreed to close this item at this time. Ms. Hernandez added that if need be, this issue could be re-opened and a new item number assigned. This item is now closed.

The fourth issue on the agenda is **Item 1508: Clarification of JPC Responsibilities**. Ms. Hernandez reported that she and Ms. Prescott were unable to review and propose revisions to the mission statement on the SCJPC.net website. This item is tabled at this time.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1516: Form 48 Simplification**. The members reviewed the current form and created a new form using the Form 9 as a template. The members extensively discussed the dates and the significance of the dates. Date boxes were added and identified. The members reconfigured the data boxes on the form. The revised form is formatted in portrait. The members discussed several scenarios and their methods of operation to aid in creating a greater user friendly form. They reviewed and discussed Operations numbers 1 through 22 for any need of revisions, or deletion. It was agreed to have the ad hoc members' review this draft of the revised form to ensure all issues were identified and noted (see attachment).

Item 1522: Pole Inspection Cycles is the last item for discussion on the agenda. Ms. Hernandez reported that from the previous meeting, the members agreed that AC item 12 could only be billed every five years. The members revised sections 19.5, 2.7-H and AC 12. It was agreed that when the revisions are approved, they would be effective and published January 2012

Lastly, the members discussed the following items under miscellaneous.

Taxing Instructions box on preliminary Form 2

Mr. Chow inquired if these boxes continue to be necessary on the form. He added that some members are utilizing the area. Ms. Hernandez responded that info is placed there because the space is available on the form. Mr. Wolfe responded that his organization utilizes this space for property tax purposes. It was agreed that these boxes remain on the form.

18.1-F Form 48 and Form 7

Mr. Chow opened discussion on 18.1-F. He stated if his organization does not have the Form 48 and his organization has verified that the work is complete his organization is allowed to issue the Form 48 and complete a Form 7. He inquired if both forms must be sent to other members or can the 18.1-F information be noted on the Form 48 and disregard the need of sending the Form 7. Mr. Wolfe stated that he has no problem with this method; however, section 18.1-F would need to be revised by eliminating reference to the Form 7. Ms. Hernandez stated that the issuing of the Form 7 is to allow the initiating members the opportunity to finalize the JPA by responding to the Form 7 stating that they would move forward with finalizing the JPA. She added that there are instances where the initiators work is not complete, therefore, not ready to finalize the JPA, but since the time has lapsed the other members party to the JPA would like to finalize it. However, she added that if the work is complete, and the Form 48 notates that there is intention of finalizing the JPA, she would support this method.

JPA Date Sent/Form 48 date sent

Ms. Pranata opened discussion on the Form 48. She inquired if a JPA with a Form 48 date sent is less than 45 days from the JPA date sent, is this acceptable billing? Ms. Hernandez responded

that initially if all members signature approved and there are no changes to the work routine than the 45 days could be waived, however, now the 45 days can no longer be waived. Ms. Pranata stated she is aware if the Form 48 date sent and the 45 days have elapsed, than the JPA can be sent to the JPC office for billing. She further stated her question is can the Form 48 date sent be less than 45 days from the preliminary JPA date sent. Ms. Hernandez stated that 45 days must elapse before sending the JPA for finalizing to the JPC office. She added that in regards to 18.1 that time frame from prelim date sent to Form 48 date sent must be 45 days and no less. Ms. Hernandez added that in instances of plant damage and records only the date of the Form 48 can be the same as the JPA date sent and this also apply to inspections and records only JPAs. Ms. Pranata inquired if the Form 48 date sent can be earlier than the prelim JPA date sent. She then presented an example where the prelim JPA date prepared was 10/8, the prelim JPA date sent was 10/15 and the Form 48 date sent was 10/8. It appears in this situation that 45 days did not elapse. Ms. Hernandez responded that if it is signed or records only the 45 days can be waived. For clarification, Ms. Pranata stated that if the JPA is 18.1 or not records only, then the 45 days must lapse before the Form 48 is sent.

Solely owned pole database

Mr. Wolfe stated that in the north if a pole is set and there is no joint interest at this time, then finals are issued so there is a record of that solely owned pole. He added that it might be beneficial to have solely owned pole information on record. It was discussed that a separate solely owned pole database could benefit the members and could provide value to other entities. The members discussed exporting their respective solely owned pole records to one database, or including solely owned poles in the current pole database. It was agreed to discuss this proposal with the member's respective organizations prior to assigning an item number to an ad hoc committee.

Tenant Grade on proposed side of Form 2

Mr. Eastwood opened discussion on tenant grade. He stated his organization is invoking section 18.1-F and when there is a tenant attachment and his organization is not noting the tenant grade when submitting the JPA for billing, the JPC office is returning the JPA due to lack of tenant grade. He inquired if the default grade could be used for that member's tenant so the JPA could be billed. Ms. Hernandez responded that the highest grade of communication could be the default grade if his organization is not aware of the tenant grade. She added that she and Mr. Chow had previously discussed this issue and agreed that perhaps the JPC office should bill the JPA even if the tenant grade is not notated. Mr. Chow added that there is no way for his organization to obtain the tenant grade information. He further added that he and Ms. Hernandez discussed that one could take the highest grade of communication, and TN would still be acceptable, however, it would be the responsibility of all members when initiating a JPA to notate tenant grade. In summation, Ms. Hernandez stated that when SCE invokes section 18.1-F the JPC office is to process the JPA even if the tenant grade is missing. However, when an initiating member does not notate TN grade on the proposed side of the JPA, it is incumbent on that member who has a tenant on their space to notate the tenant grade. She reiterated that it is the responsibility of the owning member to notate their tenant grade to ensure it gets on record. This topic will be on the Known business section of the next Board meeting agenda.

Pole set deeper than reflected in Routine

Mr. Eastwood stated there are instances when a pole is set deeper in the ground such as a 45 foot pole set six and one half feet down. The Routine states six feet in the ground for a 45 foot pole resulting in 39 feet available, however, the pole record reflects 38 feet. He inquired if the record should be changed from 38 feet to 39 on the proposed section of the Form 2? Ms. Hernandez stated that she often changes to align with the Routine. Ms. Pranata stated that the office also changes to align with the Routine. Mr. Chow stated that this might not be good practice in that some might think there is one foot available left, when in fact there is not due to the need to set the pole deeper in the ground. Mr. Wolfe stated that he does not change available space, but notates to get this information on record, that the pole was set deeper. Ms. Pranata stated that the JPC office has been instructed to make changes per the Routine. However, she added that if members notate that the pole was set deeper, and this information gets on record, then the information would never change. Mr. Eastwood stated that SCE would start making such notations in these instances for the record. It was agreed to further discuss this issue at the next meeting.

Engineered Steel Poles Less than 70'

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion on engineered steel poles. She inquired if the actual size of the pole should be noted on the JPA or should it be rounded up to the nearest pole reflected in the handbook. She stated an example of a 41 foot pole which is not documented in the handbook. Mr. Chow stated that in these cases when the pole could be any size and not standard, the calculations for space and grade would require manual computations since there is no reference in the Routine. Ms. Hernandez concluded stating that she would bring the JPA as an example for discussion to the next ad hoc meeting.

Purchase of Interest for future use

Ms. Hernandez stated that if her organization issues a Form 48 records only and on the remarks state the desire is to purchase space for an antenna to be built and complete at a future date, but the final bill would be as originally written. She added that this process does not delay other JPAs from being processed in the proper sequential order.

Mr. Chow stated that he and Mr. Wolfe had discussed the topic of purchase of interest JPAs. He added that both agreed that this situation does not necessarily dictate the purchaser build to final the JPA. He added one could own space and not be attached at that moment in time. He added with that in mind, he and Mr. Wolfe agreed that one could purchase and attach when desired. He further added that this process is in place today, and if one realizes that in the future they no longer desire the space, there is the option of relinquishment. He added that this process has been in place and works successfully. He further added that the Form 48 should state future intentions. Ms. Hernandez stated that in this situation to ensure there is enough space when you do attach your equipment, the two foot safety clearance zone should be purchased simultaneously.

Pricing Requests from Member Staff

Ms. Pranata stated that the JPC office staff has been receiving numerous requests for pricing. She requested if member staff could email this type request to the office with a one week turn around.

She added that this stops JPC staff from their immediate work and could delay them meeting their target dates for work completed.

Ms. Hernandez inquired as to what are the JPC staff being requested to price. Ms. Pranata responded for the prelim JPAs. Ms. Hernandez responded that this task is performed by her internal staff. Mr. Chow stated that this task is also performed by SCE staff. Ms. Pranata responded that the office continues to get this type of requests. Both Mr. Chow and Mr. Eastwood responded that the JPC office should not be receiving this type of requests because it is an in-house task performed within SCE by SCE staff. Mr. Chow directed Ms. Pranata that if the office receives any such requests to respond that they must contact the appropriate agent.

Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts.

- Send latest Form 48 draft to members for review.
- Discussion calendar for next Board meeting Item 1522

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m. until May10, 2011.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

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

May 10, 2011

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 11:45 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Steve Garcia – ExteNet Systems, LLC (teleconference)
Mr. Chuck Johnson – Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel (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. Dennis Ennis – T-Mobile, USA
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by **reviewing the prior months meeting minutes**. She gave a briefing of the prior meeting minutes. She stated that she was to bring a JPA example of an engineered steel pole; however, she did not and would bring it to the next meeting. There were no questions or comments on the minutes.

The next item on the agenda is **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. Ms. Hernandez stated this is a standing agenda item and it pertains to getting foreign JPAs final billed. There were no questions or concerns on this issue.

The third issue on the agenda is **Item 1472: Pole Replacement Requirement**. Ms. Hernandez stated that at the previous meeting she requested this item be closed. In that there were no objections to closing this item, Ms. Hernandez proposed to close this item. She added that if need be; this issue could be assigned another item number in the future. This item is now closed.

The fourth issue on the agenda is **Item 1508: Clarification of JPC Responsibilities**. Ms. Hernandez presented the first draft of the proposed revisions to the mission statement on the SCJCP.net home page. She added that per prior discussions, it was agreed that clarification is needed to reflect that the JPC staff is not the committee, but that the utility members are the committee (see attachment I for proposed revisions). Ms. Hernandez than described the revisions and the intent for change. The members reviewed the revised mission statement.

Some changes were added and it was agreed to upload the revised mission statement to the SCJPC.net home page.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1516: Form 48 Simplification**. Mr. Chow shared suggestions posed to him by his staff for the first Form 48 draft. The members reviewed the suggestions presented by SCE, and discussed and added other revisions to the first draft. After extensive discussion it was agreed to add a second page to accommodate enough room for remarks/changes. The members discussed several scenarios in regards to completing a Form 48 correctly, and making the form user friendly for all fielders and other personnel. The objective is to ensure that all necessary information is noted on the form. One piece of information all members agree is necessary and should be required is all pole numbers.

Ms. Haney stated that the Basic Training Module currently available on the SCJPC web site should reflect the revised form and the proper method of completion.

Ms. Prescott suggested having the members fielders review the revised form to ascertain if the form would capture all the necessary information required on the form.

A PDF file of the form is to be sent to all members to have their fielders review the revised form.

Lastly, the members addressed miscellaneous issues. The first issue discussed is *space and grade and the point of attachment*. Ms. Haney stated that if your grade is 25 down 1, you can attach no lower than 24' 1". Mr. Chow stated that there are some members that interpret space and grade differently, and his concern is that there should be consistency. Mr. Hernandez stated that the understanding is the attachment could be anywhere from 24 feet, 1 inch up to 25 feet or 25 feet down to 24 feet, 1 inch. The members reviewed section 16.2 and agreed to revise the verbiage for clarification on grade and space. (see attachment II).

The last miscellaneous topic is *Guy poles*. Ms. Hernandez questioned when there is a guy pole that is 50/50 and a third party is attaching a cable, how is space allocated? She inquired if this is treated as other poles and space is allocated as such. Ms. Pranata stated that in these instances, the base owner bills the incoming member according to space and grade. She added if guy is on all three members, the cost is shared equally. Ms. Hernandez stated that many times her problem is that she is not aware of the other member attachments on the guy pole. Ms. Hernandez is satisfied and thanked all for their input.

Ms. Hernandez revisited *Records only and the Form 48* discussed at the prior meeting. She added that if a wireless member has a JPA on hold and cannot build yet due to jurisdiction or other issues, and this JPA is holding back subsequent JPAs, it was discussed to issue a Form 48 stating "for records only, site to be built at a later date". This process would allow final billing the JPA, and allowing following JPAs to be billed as well. This would be only in instances of purchasing and not replacements. After brief discussion it was agreed to place this concern on the JPA alert. The alert would read as follows:

Purchase of interest in poles or anchors JPAs can be final billed prior to construction per section 4.0, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4. Form 48 issued stating "Records Only", and 45 days will be waived.

Mr. Chow questioned if a transaction is just a *correction of records*, he inquired why is a prelim Form 2 necessary, and could the final Form 2 be the only document processed. Ms. Hernandez responded that based on situations she has experienced, in her opinion, a prelim is necessary because some corrections were wrong. This allows the other parties the opportunity to ensure that the correction is in order. She added that the prelim would require approval signatures. After discussion it was agreed that this type JPA (correction of records) should originate on a prelim.

Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts.

- Ms. Corella to send Form 48 draft to all members in PDF format.
- Update revised mission statement to SCJPC.net home page.
- Ms. Hernandez to bring JPA with 41 foot steel pole to next meeting.
- Records only JPA alert.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m. until June, 2011.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

Attachment I

The Southern California Joint Pole Committee

The Joint Pole Committee is made up of a group of member representatives of utilities, [communications](#), and municipalities in Southern California who hold joint equity interest in utility poles. Established by telephone, electricity and railroad companies, the Committee has existed since October 10, 1906. It was formed as a result of the need to limit the number of poles in the field and to create a uniform procedure for recording ownership of poles. Each member has a vote and shares in the expenses of the Committee according to their joint pole interests. [The Committee meetings are held in accordance to the SCJPC By-Laws.](#)

[The Committee employs an administrative staff whose purpose](#) is to keep accurate records of ownership for each jointly-owned 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 [staff](#) prepares monthly Bills of Sale [which are sent](#) to the members to enable them to make monetary settlement of their joint enterprises.

Update ASAP.

Attachment II

16.2 Space

Space is measured downward in one foot increments from the highest grade purchased. Example: 25-1: attachment grade can be made anywhere from 25' down to 24'1". When safety clearance is not required all usable space will be allocated and priced accordingly.

(Revised May 2011)

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

June 14, 2011

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

Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Chuck Johnson – Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Ms. Debbie Wooten – NextG Networks (teleconference)
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Serv/AT&T Comm
Mr. Dennis Ennis – T-Mobile, USA
Mr. David Callender – ATC Outdoor DAS (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by **reviewing the prior months meeting minutes**. There were no questions or comments on the May meeting minutes.

The next item on the agenda is **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. Ms. Hernandez stated this is a standing agenda item and it pertains to getting foreign JPAs final billed. There were no questions or concerns on this issue.

The third issue on the agenda is **Item 1516: Form 48 Simplification**. Ms. Hernandez inquired if any members had attempted utilizing the draft form, and if so are there any questions or comments on the draft. The primary focus of this exercise is to create a Form 48 that is user friendly, and to simplify the form to be consistent with operations today.

Mr. Chow responded that he circulated the draft within his organization and reported that he did not receive any negative comments, and viewed the multiple page(s) as positive. He received a suggestion of placing the field for the JPA number in the upper right hand corner to be consistent with the Form 2. This would follow with other forms when the Form 48 is in landscape format.

The members revised the header information from the prior draft. The members discussed dates and their relevance to the processing of the Form. Also discussed are the fields on the form to be completed by the field personnel versus the office staff of respective members.

The members extensively discussed identifying these fields in a specific format as an aid to those completing the form.

The operations numbers were extensively discussed. The members shared different scenarios and processes practiced within their respective organizations. Additional columns were added to identify hand dig and pole cut lengths. The members revised the operation numbers and have added a 13th operation. It was agreed that too much bolded text would lose impact; therefore, the members identified which text only should be bolded. The consensus is that the following text would be in **bold**:

- **Form 48** title
- Operation 2 – **specify nature of conflict in remarks.**
- Operation 3- **when not on JPA**
- Operation 7 – **only applies to base owner**
- Operation 8 – **substructure conflict only**
- Operation 9 – **i.e. MITC poles, alternative to wood poles**
- Operation 11 – **Only**
- Operation 12 – **Must list poles below or attach JPA**
- Operation 13 – **purchase/relinquish**
- Body of form – the words **Required**

The members then comprehensively reviewed and discussed the revised draft. It was agreed that this latest draft would be on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting for review by board members. This form will become available and be acceptable in both portrait and landscape format. Once there is board approval on the current form (in portrait), then the landscape version would be created and become available to the members for their use. The purpose of offering this form in landscape version is that the JPAs, and other form, are in landscape format and it would ease review and filing of all forms if they are uniform.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1526: Review of Section 13.2**. This issue addresses the title of the section, “refund”. Mr. Wolfe stated that in some instances there are additional monies due, and not always a refund. He added that the paragraph description primarily addresses refunds only, and should address adjustments as well. After reviewing the section paragraph it was agreed to revise the title. After brief discussion the consensus is to have the section title read, “Cost Adjustments”. Ms. Hernandez proposed that members review the section paragraph and return next month with any suggestions for revisions. This item is to remain open.

Lastly, the members addressed miscellaneous issues. Mr. Wolfe opened by stating that per the glossary under equipment he is proposing a definition for **2-(C) for Sidewalk Guy**. The description would read: **Guy connected from pole to pipe brace to anchor rod.** This addition would be published on the JPA Alert webpage.

Next, Mr. Chow stated that in regards to SCE **tenants attaching in an incorrect space**, he has created a letter for the tenant. In the letter it gives the tenant the option to attach correctly as recorded in the proper space, or contact the owners whose space they are occupying incorrectly and lease from them. The letter would be sent initially to the tenant, and if the tenant

opts to rearrange correctly, than the record is correctly reflected. However, if the tenant opts to lease from the members whose space they are occupying, then a letter is sent to the other member notifying them that they should expect the tenant to make leasing arrangements with them. He closed by stating that this is the SCE process for this type situation.

Mr. Wolfe inquired if a list of members tenants contacts and numbers available on the website would have value to the committee. He suggested the page title read, "Known Tenant Attachments". This would allow members to contact tenants directly to report any issues or infractions. He concluded that he is of the opinion that this type page would be valuable to members. **Item 1528: Tenant List for GO 95 Notification** has been given to discuss this proposal, and has been assigned to the Operating committee.

Lastly, Ms. Pranata presented her list of billing questions:

1. Members listed on header of JPA but not on poles. Should member be lined out? The member name should be lined out.
2. Example: Pole height is 50' - JPA notation pole topped at 31' grade. Should pole height remain 50' and process as such, or return the JPA. Ms. Hernandez responded that the JPA should be returned to the initiator and inquire what size should the pole read. When it is returned to the JPC office, the space and grade should coordinate with the height of the pole. The initiator should notate 35' pole with the 50' in brackets. The space and grade would be for 35'.
3. Notation topped pole 30' – grade 24-1. Is the office allowed to change to read 25-2 per section 16? It was agreed to change space and grade to 25-2.

Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts.

- Members to provide suggested revisions for Section 13.2.
- Form 48 draft to be on the discussion calendar of the June board meeting.
- JPA Alert for addition to Glossary Equipment.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m. until July, 2011.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

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

July 12, 2011

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 9:20 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Chuck Johnson – Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel (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. Dennis Ennis – T-Mobile, USA
Mr. David Callender – ATC Outdoor DAS (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by stating that due to an emergency illness the manager was unable to prepare an agenda and the prior months meeting minutes. The members used the prior month's agenda.

The first item discussed is **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. Ms. Hernandez stated this is a standing agenda item and it pertains to getting foreign JPAs final billed. There were no questions or concerns on this issue.

The next item on the agenda is **Item 1516: Form 48 Simplification**. Ms. Hernandez inquired if any members had attempted utilizing the draft form, and if so, were there any questions

Mr. Hunter responded that his office has not utilized the new form yet, however, he added that he is very pleased with the form.

Mr. Chow responded that he too is satisfied with the form, and is waiting to view the form in landscape format. He added when the form is approved by the board, he would create the landscape format.

In that the latest draft of the form was not sent by the manager, Ms. Pranata stated that she would send it out to the Routine ad hoc members to review it, and test it prior to bringing it to the board for final approval.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1526: Review of Section 13.2**. Section 13.2 is titled Refunds, however, it applies to refunds and monies owed. Mr. Wolfe suggested the words

debits and credits be somehow inserted into the section. Ms. Hernandez stated that she would review and revise the verbiage in section 13.2 and present her revisions to the ad hoc committee next month.

Lastly, the members addressed **miscellaneous** issues. Ms. Hernandez opened discussion by stating that when a member tops a pole the only section that refers to **pole topping** is Section 5.0. She added that per her recollection, the Routine had a section for topping of a pole. Mr. Wolfe stated that he would research older handbooks in an attempt to locate the former section referring to pole topping. Mr. Hunter noted that there are no costs involved, that this is for record keeping purposes. Ms. Prescott stated that topping a pole can change the class of the pole. Mr. Wolfe stated that the species of the wood determines the class. It was discussed that both factors can change pole class.

Mr. Wolfe located an old handbook with the section alluding to pole topping. The members reviewed the older section. **Item 1530: Section for topping pole** has been assigned to this concern and ad hoc committee for further discussion. It was agreed to use section 5.2 to address this issue and title it, "Topping Pole and Retaining Interest". Ms. Smith will work on creating the verbiage for this new section.

Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts.

- Ms. Pranata to send Form 48 draft to the ad hoc members for testing.
- Ms. Smith and Ms. Hernandez to create verbiage for section 5.2.
- Ms. Hernandez will revise Section 13.2.

The meeting adjourned at 10.00 a.m. until August, 2011.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

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

August 9, 2011

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. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison
Mr. Chuck Johnson – Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel (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. Dennis Ennis – T-Mobile, USA
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by stating that there are no minutes for review. She then moved on to the first agenda item, **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. Ms. Hernandez stated that this item is a list sent from members that are their foreign JPAs requesting the initiator final or research the outstanding JPAs. She added that the members who have sent lists in the past are SCE, and DWP.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1526: Review of Section 13.2**. Ms. Hernandez suggested adding verbiage to section 13.1 to address issues when the correction of record results in additional money owed. Section 13.1 title could be revised to read, “Corrections of record/cost recovery” which alludes to additional monies owed. It was agreed that this revision would be on the JPA Alert webpage, and on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting.

Lastly, the members addressed the following **miscellaneous** issues.

Street Lights – 4.1 Chart

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion by stating that in reference to street lights if you find that you are unauthorized, it is a section 4.0. She added that this issue was discussed, but she does not understand how street lights were omitted from the 4.1 chart. Mr. Wolfe stated that the omission could be due that street lights are an exception in GO 95. He added that street lights are not necessarily owned by power utilities, but sometimes the municipality. Mr. Chow added that street lights are not a part of distribution for SCE; they are a system of their own.

Ms. Hernandez inquired if there is no need to include street lights in the 4.1 chart? Mr. Wolfe responded that he is up the opinion that street lights are a different category perhaps service category and should not be included in the 4.1 chart. After discussion, it was agreed that street lights would be treated as a service drop and a 4.0.

Item 1530: Section number for topping Poles

Ms. Hernandez stated that this item number was not on the agenda. It refers to the cutting of the pole. She added that Ms. Smith has created a new section for 5.2 it is titled "Cutting and Vacating Space Exceeding 55 ft". She has also created the description for section 5.2.

Ms. Smith proceeded to read the description to the members. The members extensively discussed topping of poles and reviewed the proposed section verbiage. When discussion was complete, the members agreed on changing the title of the section to read, "**Topping and Retaining Interest on Poles 60' or Greater in Length.**", and revised the section verbiage. (See attachment for final revision). It was agreed to place this item on the discussion calendar of the next administrative board meeting.

Form 48

Lastly, the members discussed the recently approved Form 48. Ms. Hernandez inquired if any member's staff has utilized the new Form 48 and if there were any comments. Mr. Hunter stated that he received a request on direction on how exactly to complete the form. Ms. Haney stated that it should have a pole legend. It was agreed that a new sample JPA is required for the handbook in section 18 with directions on how to complete the new revised form and an example for the Basic JPA training module. Ms. Pranata inserted a pole legend. It was agreed that this issue be on the discussion calendar of the next administrative board meeting. It was agreed to add item 1516 back to the agenda.

Form 7

Mr. Chow stated that he was of the opinion that it was agreed when a Form 7 is initiated to stop billing it should be exchanged amongst members and not be sent to the JPC office. Ms. Hernandez responded that according to her recollection, both the JPC office and the member(s) are notified simultaneously. If there is an issue to be resolved, the billing is stopped via notification to the JPC office, until the members arrive at a resolution. Mr. Chow stated that the Form 7 should be transacted between the members, and the JPC office is CC'd a copy. The JPC office maintained a file for Form 7's of what JPAs not to bill. Ms. Hernandez stated that both processes are similar. Mr. Wolfe stated that he is in agreement with Mr. Chow, that the Form 7 is a tool to be transacted between members. Ms. Hernandez stated that she too agrees, but in the event that a final arrives at the JPC office prior to the Form 7 getting to the member(s) and a resolution has been reached, the JPA in question could in the interim get billed. A correction of record is greater troublesome than stopping the JPC office from billing a JPA prior to closing the billing month. It was agreed that the members would transact the form and CC the JPC office.

Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts.

- For the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting, sections 13.1, 13.2, 5.2, and the Form 48 with legend.
- JPA Alert on Form 7 protest – Form 7 to member, and initiator with CC to JPC office.
- JPA Alert Form 48 highlighting revisions, additions and changes.

The meeting adjourned at 10.50 a.m. until September 13, 2011.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

Attachment

Section 5.2 (New Section)

Topping and Retaining Interest on Poles 60' or Greater in Length

When an owner deems it desirable or necessary to vacate and eliminate the top portion of a pole 60' or greater in length and yet retain its interest due to other space it occupies on the pole, that utility may cut off and retain unused portion of pole at its own expense. Salvage value shall be based on new length of pole and owners shall then share interest in accordance with section 16.4.

(Revised August 2011)

Discussion calendar for Admin Board, along with modified Sec 13.1.

08/09/2011

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

September 13, 2011

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

Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison
Mr. Adolph Gonzales – Southern California Edison
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Serv/AT&T Comm
Mr. Dennis Ennis – T-Mobile, USA
Mr. Larry Thorne – NewPath Networks (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by requesting members review the minutes of the prior meeting. She gave an overview of the meeting by stating that she had considered adding the street lights to the 4.1 chart, but after reconsideration, this idea was dropped. Also, Section 5.2 the new section for topping poles will be on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting. The final draft of the Form 48 will also be on discussion for the next Board meeting. She then inquired if any members had any additions, deletions, or revisions. There were no comments on the minutes.

Ms. Hernandez then moved on to the first agenda item, **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. Ms. Hernandez stated that this is a standing item, and is a list sent from members that are requesting initiating members to final or research outstanding foreign JPAs. Mr. Wolfe commented that he views this process as positive in that he has been receiving lists from members which aid in finalizing JPAs. Mr. Hernandez agreed that she too is receiving lists. There were no further comments on this item.

The third issue on the agenda is **Item 1516: Form 48 Simplification**. Mr. Walls presented samples for the Form 48 to be added to the Basic JPA training Module and section 18 of the routine handbook. The members viewed the samples. Mr. Walls stated that his office would be using the new form with some slight modifications in that DWP forms are completed by field personnel. The members extensively discussed using the Form 7 versus the Form 48.

They discussed different field scenarios to ensure that the Form 48 addressed as many situations as possible. The form was reviewed line per line. The members worked on creating a sample for the handbook and the training module. The current examples in the handbook are to be used to create the sample Form 48. The consensus is to place this item number on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting for a final approval.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1526: Review of Section 13.2**. Ms. Hernandez stated that these revisions were accepted by the ad hoc and would be placed on the discussion calendar of the next board meeting for possible board approval.

The fifth issue on the agenda is **Item 1530: Section for Topping Pole**. Section 5.2 has been accepted by the ad hoc and will be on the discussion calendar of the next board meeting for possible board approval.

Lastly, the members addressed the following **miscellaneous** issues.

Section 7.4

Mr. Walls opened discussion on **Section 7.4**. He added that he believes this is a stand-alone section. Ms. Hernandez responded that it is not because it does not direct to why one is replacing a pole. Mr. Scott stated why section 7.4 when AC 19 a, b, and c are the costs for placing a pole in the same hole. Ms. Hernandez responded that there is a differential between members in costs. Ms. Hernandez stated that pole in same hole once required a 1.2. It was discovered that waiting for special agreement delayed finalizing of the JPA, so section 7.4 was created to quickly alert one that this JPA required immediate attention.

Section 7.13

Mr. Walls inquired if the members could agree on a blanket approval on instances that are common and straight forward. He added that there are instances when DWP is given 30 days for a transaction to be completed and must wait for approval or 45 day period to move forward.

Mr. Wolfe stated that there have been instances when he receives a JPA only to find that the work has already been done without approval and prior to 45 days. He added that if there is no great impact and the work is correct he continues and processes the JPA. The right thing has been done, even if not in the proper order, he sees no harm, no foul.

Ms. Hernandez stated that she receives JPAs noting “JPAs after the fact”. The field work is already complete, thus not allowing participating members to approve or deny. She added when fielding the site and there is no effect to the facilities the JPA is unchanged. However, if there is an impact on the facilities, then the JPA changes to a 7.13.

Mr. Chow stated that in instances where there is no harm, no foul, other members insist on floating a 7.13. Some instances some members agree on 7.11, where other members add 7.13.

Ms. Hernandez stated that this situation should be further explored in that per the Routine if joint members do not have the opportunity to field check and approve or deny; it is a 7.13. If the work is complete prior to approval it is a 7.13, there is no grey area. She added she agrees with the concept that there is no harm, no foul it is fine. It was agreed to further review and discuss this issue at the next ad hoc meeting.

Section 7.6

Mr. Ennis opened discussion on plant damage. He stated that his organization has a cell site that has been out of service since June of this year, and he has been informed that SCE has a new design directive not to repeat full mounted meters on plant damages.

Mr. Chow responded that this is not a new directive it is in the ESR (Edison Electrical Service Requirements) that poles are one of the prohibited site for meter loading. He further added that it has always been a prohibited site to meter customers on poles. However, SCE is aware that they are out in the field. If the meter is not damaged it will be placed on the pole, and if the meter is damaged no meter will be placed again on the pole.

Mr. Ennis stated that SCE has never placed a panel on a pole, his organization places the panel. He added to have wireless place meters on pedestals, private property or a service pole on private property is cost ineffective for the wireless.

Mr. Chow stated that per of the design of the ESR, meters are prohibited on poles.

Mr. Ennis stated that he understands that SCE would not meter poles, but he inquired why SCE would not re-meter a cell site.

Mr. Chow stated that SCE would not re-meter poles, and that someone is under the impression that there is a grandfather clause for meters. He added there is no grandfather clause for meters. He further added that safety is an issue in regards to meters.

Mr. Ennis stated that in his opinion he does not see a safety issue in many meter instances, and SCE is forcing wireless to utilize other cost ineffective methods to obtain wireless service. Mr. Eastwood stated that the safety issue is the safety of the meter reader personnel servicing and accessing the meter on the pole; this is the SCE concern, it is not necessarily the pole.

The members extensively discussed the SCE criteria, requirements and restrictions pertaining to meters. Mr. Ennis concluded by stating that his questions have been answered.

Rule 94

Next, Mr. Ennis stated that power members are not replacing plant damage poles tall enough to meet Rule 94. Mr. Chow stated that it is a GO 95 issue versus a non-GO 95 issue, however; he added that when replaced it must be replaced with Rule 94 in mind. Mr. Ennis reiterated that planners are not taking into account Rule 94.

Mr. Chow stated that on an existing pole there is grandfathering for Rule 94, however on replacements the credit standards must be met.

Mr. Ennis reiterated that he would like to see the planner take into consideration Rule 94: perhaps they are unaware of this relatively new ruling. The power members agreed to address this issue within their respective organizations.

Form 7 to pull JPA

Ms. Pranata inquired into the Form 7 and if the office will continue to receive this form requesting to pull or stop billing on a JPA.

Mr. Hernandez responded that historically when she was employed by H, she would receive advance copies of JPAs and if she noted a problem, she could pull and stop the JPA from finalizing prior to closing of the month via a Form 7. She added that she was informed that when FRIEND was implemented one could no longer stop billing.

Ms. Corella responded that prior to FRIEND if a month was closed you could reopen the month and make the correction. However, with FRIEND it was no longer possible to reopen a closed month, but if the month is not closed, a JPA could be pulled via a Form 7.

Mr. Chow stated that his organization pulls JPAs from billing prior to the month being closed and balanced.

Ms. Hernandez stated that this must be clarified to all members. She added that originally she misunderstood and was under the opinion that under no conditions could a JPA be stopped once submitted per FRIEND. It was agreed that a JPA could be stopped if the current month is not closed and balanced. Ms. Hernandez stated that all members' party to the JPA should be notified and the JPC office copied. It was agreed to create a list of acceptable reasons for pulling a JPA in a current open month.

Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts.

- For the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting, sections 13.1, 13.2, 5.2.
- Form 48 on discussion calendar
- Item 1530: Section for topping Pole.

The meeting adjourned at 1.50 p.m. until October 11, 2011.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

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

October 11, 2011

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 11:00 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

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

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting by stating that at the previous meeting, the members reviewed and made some changes to the Form 48. Members discussed the interpretation of Section 7.13 failure to initiate a JPA. Discussed as well was the criterion for initiating a Form 7. She concluded by requesting all members review the minutes for details.

Ms. Hernandez then moved on to the first agenda item, **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. Ms. Hernandez stated that this is a standing item, and is a list sent from members that are requesting initiating members to final or research outstanding foreign JPAs. She added that she is receiving lists from SCE on these outstanding JPAs.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1526: Review of Section 13.2**. Ms. Hernandez stated that these revisions were accepted by the ad hoc, presented to the board for discussion and returned to this ad hoc for further work. It was a question of the title. The members read the paragraph verbiage associated with this section. The members noted that one can make a correction of record when needed; however, refunds have a statute of a five year limitation. After extensively discussing this section and several scenarios associated with it, it was agreed to place this item number on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting.

The fourth issue on the agenda is **Item 1532: 18.1-F Form 48**. Ms. Hernandez has created an example for the newly revised Form 48 to be published in the handbook. Ms. Hernandez requested the members to review her example to ensure that the example is in line with the current method of completing the form within their respective offices. The members

discussed situations and made minor changes to the example. It was agreed that poles numbers were required on the form with the associated operation number. The JPA could be attached, but the poles require an associated operation number on the form. It was agreed to place this item on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting to decide whether to retain or delete the verbiage “or attach JPA” from the form. The members reviewed and discussed the entire example and the associated verbiage correlating with the example.

Lastly, the members addressed the following **miscellaneous** issues.

Note obstruction (sketch) on JPA for pole replacement - H

Mr. Ennis stated that in the wireless world a sketch of the pole and obstruction is sent to members. Mr. Wolfe stated that this situation may require the sharing of cost for removal of the obstruction, or it may entail a letter to the owner of the private property where the pole is obstructed to remove obstruction so the pole can be removed. He added that he would attempt to develop some verbiage to address this issue.

Mr. Ennis stated that in his opinion a sketch is a good aid in this type situations; however, if it requires a joint meet in the field, this would be difficult in light of time constraints.

Ms. Hernandez informed Mr. Wolfe that a write up is not necessary, but would let the minutes reflect that when there is an obstruction man-made project obstructing the removal of a pole that the JPA should be accompanied with a sketch or picture of the obstructing object. This would place all members’ party to this JPA on notice.

Mr. Chow stated that SCE is mandated by their environmental group that once a pole has ended its useful life it must be removed from the environment.

These situations require a special agreement. Mr. Chow stated that a JPA alert on this could be an educational communicational benefit to all members now and moving forward. Mr. Chow and Mr. Wolfe would collaborate on verbiage for the JPA alert.

Section 7.13

Ms. Hernandez requested an item be assigned to clarification of Section 7.13. Item 1535 has been assigned to this issue. She reported that she is receiving JPAs notating “after the fact JPA”. The work is already done when she receives the JPA, and they should be initiated as 7.13, but she is receiving them section 7.11. She added that there is a difference of opinion when 7.11 versus 7.13 are applicable.

Mr. Chow stated that the misconception is in the verbiage of the section. It states a JPA must be initiated, however, does not specify when; prior to construction, or at any time. The section is left open to many interpretations.

Ms. Hernandez stated that she understands the ambiguous language in the section; however, the method of after the fact JPAs does not allow the receiving party the option to contest the JPA. She added that she does agree if no harm, no foul, section 7.11 can be applied. However, if this creates a cost for the receiving party then the initiating party should apply 7.13.

Mr. Wolfe stated that he agrees with Mr. Chow in that the section does not state when in time the JPA must be processed, merely, that a JPA must be initiated. He added that even if this is not in the spirit of the committee, the section verbiage requires revision for clarification.

Ms. Hernandez added that in many pole replacements in terms of wireless, initiators are not taking into account Rule 94 and are replacing like for like. She added that if she receives a 7.11 after the fact JPA and a taller pole is required for the Rule 94 SCZ, there is the cost of replacing the replaced pole with a taller pole. Therefore, section 7.13 applies in this instance, and not section 7.11. It was noted that there are other methods to meet Rule 94 than just pole replacement, i.e. pole top extension.

It was agreed that section 7.13 title be revised by removing “of” and replacing it with “Prior to”, and in the paragraph replacing “without” with “prior to”. This revision would be placed on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting.

Form 7 JPC Guidelines

It was agreed that an item number for addressing when Forms 7 could be issued to stop a JPA from being billed in the current month is required for discussion within this ad hoc committee. **Item 1536: Form 7 to JPC Guidelines** has been assigned to this ad hoc. The members briefly described what could be accepted in the JPC office via a form 7. It was agreed to discuss this issue further at the next meeting.

Attaching to Arms

Ms. Pranata stated the office receives JPAs attaching to arms, and **item 164-E** is not noted. She questioned if the office could assume this item. Ms. Hernandez responded if it is an existing arm, and shows 100%, and 50/50 on the pole the billers may insert 164-E. She added to place a note on the JPA as a training aide so in the future they will note it.

Arm type

Ms. Pranata questioned if members should note what type arm is being placed initially. Ms. Hernandez responded if there is no billing required or the arm type is not recorded on record, then arm type is not necessary.

Neutral Ground Attachment

Mr. Eastwood announced that SCE is experiencing a problem with communications attaching to their neutral ground. He added that this is allowed under certain conditions and there are agreements with AT&T and Verizon California, however; he added that today communications are attaching to neutral ground wherever it is available. He added that the danger is not to SCE, but to any communication personnel that does not identify that it is a neutral and attach to a primary ground. There have been fatalities as a result of this practice. To this he added that the committee must come to terms on how to stop this practice. SCE has identified 400 of these type situations, and has sent notices to members but they are being returned stating “we are authorized to attach to your ground”. This statement is true only in certain instances. This problem must be addressed and resolved. Mr. Eastwood concluded by stating that he would like the members to give this issue some thought and perhaps assign it to an ad hoc committee for further discussion.

He also reported that SCE has scheduled a Customer Information Meeting, and that the SCE IMF personnel will be at this meeting.

Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts.

- Ms. Pranata to provide a list of Forms 7 that are sent to the JPC office.
- Discussion Calendar section 13.1
- Discussion Calendar Form 48 Example.
- Mr. Chow and Mr. Wolfe to collaborate on verbiage for obstruction on pole replacement.
- Discussion Calendar Item 1535: Clarification of Section 7.13

The meeting adjourned at 2.30 p.m. until November 8, 2011.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

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

November 8, 2011

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

Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles
Ms. Lynne Prescott -
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Michael Wolf - AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility (teleconference)
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 stating that she reviewed the minutes of the previous meeting and she is in agreement with them. She inquired if any members had any revisions for the minutes. There were no comments or questions on the minutes.

Ms. Hernandez then moved on to the second agenda item, **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. Ms. Hernandez stated this issue is a standing item and addressed at every meeting.

The third issue on the agenda is **Item 1532: 18.1-F Form 48**. Ms. Hernandez briefed the members that at the prior meeting, it was agreed not to allow attachment of the JPA to the form. The previous discussion is whether to allow the attaching of the JPA to the form in lieu of listing the pole numbers on the form since the pole numbers are already recorded on the JPA. Ms. Haney stated that the opposition to using the JPA for obtaining the pole numbers versus listing the pole numbers on the form is that there is no place on the JPA to list the operation numbers corresponding to the poles, where there is a field to list the operation number on the Form 48. Mr. Hunter stated that in regards to inspections, is it required to list the inspected pole numbers on the Form 48? Ms. Hernandez stated that normally she does not receive a Form 48 with inspections. Ms. Pearson stated that she receives a Form 48 with the inspection JPA and a list of poles attached. Ms. Hernandez stated that a Form 48 is not needed with inspections since the JPA notes the inspection date and the inspections have transpired. The JPC office must have the Form 48 date on the JPA to process it.

Mr. Hunter inquired into pole stubbing and the listing of poles on the Form 48. Ms. Hernandez stated as in inspections, in pole stubbing the work has already been performed so a Form 48 is not really needed. After extensive discussion the members made revisions to

sections 18.1-D and 19.5 to aid clarification of inspections in regards to routine. The Form 48 was discussed and revised. The revised form would be placed on the discussion section of the agenda for the next Board meeting and the revisions to sections 18.1-D and 19.5.

The fourth item on the agenda is **Item 1535: Clarification of Section 7.13**. The members discussed and agreed on the revised clarification. The issue is that a notice of intent JPA must be issued, however, it does not clarify when in the process does the JPA have to be issued. It is agreed that the JPA is required to be issued PRIOR to replacement. The members discussed this section and made revisions for clarification (see attached). This item would be placed on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting.

The fifth issue on the agenda is **Item 1536: Form 7 to JPC Guidelines**. Ms. Hernandez stated that this issue is for clarification of instances when a Form 7 should be addressed to the JPC office. She inquired if the JPC office is receiving Form 7's for other than stopping a JPA from being processed. Ms. Pranata responded that she is not certain of all instances when the office should be receiving the forms, however; when a form is received it is noted in the system and then filed. The list notes the different scenarios of when a form 7 was received in the JPC office. Ms. Hernandez stated that any form 7 addressed to the JPC office should only pertain to a final bill. She added anything that pertains to a preliminary JPA should not be sent to the JPC office. Ms. Pranata provided a list of Form 7 instances that have been received by the JPC office. Ms. Hernandez stated that the JPC office should not make corrections on finals submitted to the office. If there are any changes required to the final JPA, then the JPA must be returned to the initiator and the initiator is to make the correction and re-submit the JPA. The members reviewed and discussed the scenarios on the list provided by Ms. Pranata.

Mr. Chow stated that the Form 7 is a communication between members with a CC to the JPC office notifying them that members are not in agreement and are resolving the issue. A Form 7 should not be used to direct the JPC office to act on a final JPA. He added that this is not the original intent of the form.

The members reviewed and discussed for clarification the Form 7 received list provided by Ms. Pranata for clarification (see attachment). As a result, **Item 1540: Review of Changing Pole Location Process** has been assigned to this ad hoc committee.

The sixth item on the agenda is **Item 1537: Example 8 Revision**. The example refers to correction of record. It was agreed to table this item until the next ad hoc meeting.

The seventh issue on the agenda is **Item 1539: Review of Section 4.0**. Mr. Chow proposed holding this item until next year. This item is on hold.

Lastly, the members addressed the following **miscellaneous** issues. Ms. Pranata questioned if sections 5.5 and 9.4 are interchangeable. Ms. Hernandez responded that they are different scenarios. Ms. Pranata then questioned if a safety clearance is necessary when the L voltage is changed to guy. Ms. Chow responded that when grade/space is allocated there is no need for SZC.

Mr. Chow opened discussion on PG&E. The question is how to process work that has PG&E poles on a JPA where the parties are not just E and PG&E since PG&E opted not to sign the

current 1998 Agreement. He discussed the option of a cost causer to final the work processed via the JPC office or other member offices. He stated that E has a MOU with PG&E to transact work between the two. However, he added that the issue is the third party member on the pole that is not part of the MOU between E and PG&E. The MOU ties E and PG&E, the committee ties E and the other member, but there is nothing to tie PG&E to the other third party committee member. He added that it is very difficult if all members are not tied together by the same agreement. Mr. Wolfe proposed that a simple resolution is tenancy, or a limited membership where their membership would be only for removal of ownership and not allowed to purchase. Mr. Chow stated that PG&E would like to transact on the 800 plus poles that they are joint with in the South. They would favor the cost causer option to compensate for the processing, maintenance and materials necessary to process their poles that are in the SCJPC database. The members agreed that there are two options, one is the cost causer and the other could be limited membership. Ms. Hernandez stated that the City of Banning and the City of Vernon returned and their assessments were bridged from the time the 1998 Agreement was implemented to the date they returned. In that this issue is an operating committee concern, this will be discussed further at the next operating ad hoc committee meeting.

Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts.

- On discussion 18.1-D and 19.5
- On discussion latest draft of revised Form 48 – Item 1532

The meeting adjourned at 3.45 p.m. until January, 2012.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

Attachment

7.13 Failure to Issue Notice of Intention Prior to ~~of~~ Replacement.

If any member replaces pole(s) or anchors (s) prior to ~~without~~ issuing a Notice of Intention to the joint owners on record, that member will perform work (without compensation) or:

- ~~Will~~ pay all PTD charges
- ~~Will~~ pay all transfer charges of the joint owner(s)
- ~~Will~~ pay for any additional authorized costs incurred due to the pole replacement

This section will not apply to pole replacements agreed to for emergencies, priority poles or storm conditions. For these replacements, use section 7.11. For plant damage replacements refer to section 7.6. (Revised November 2011)

Effective January 2012.

On discussion for Board Meeting next week Nov 16, 2011.

Attachment

JPA NUMBER	DATE RECEIVED	FROM	TO	CC TO	BOX CHECKED	REMARKS	Accept? (Y/N)	Notes
Multiple JPA Numbers	Varies			SCJPC		DO NOT BILL	Y	
E6027-6787	4/14/2011	ATC	E/HLA	none	none	Change PTD from HLA to ATC line 7 add 83 ATC to transfer HLA 1(1)	N	
E6030-0986	12/16/2010	ATC	E	none	none	Page 2 line 4 20a down guy does not belong to ATC, belongs to HSO	N	
E6030-7551	6/20/2011	HSO	E	SCJPC	Correction to Read	Please correct records, change pulling routine for pole 262757s (page 2, #9) originally H to PTD. Please change show "E To PTD" due to it's modular butt	N	
E6030-403120814	9/20/2010	E	HSO/ATC/HLA/JPC	none	ADD, CORRECT TO READ	Pole 1211172e add sec 13.1 corr util this is HSO instead of HLA (Pole card is wrong).	N	
E6034-40240416	6/25/2010	E	SCJPC	none	Correct to read	To whomever, please change utility for the 2 pole cards attached, poles 1048063e and 290732e are shared with HSO not HLA.	N	Need pole records from all members attached. Will be discussed in Jan 2012 RR Meeting.
E6035-403438614	4/15/2011	ATC	E/VZ/NG	none	none	Line 2, charge PTD to NG, line 5, 83 VZ to pay ATC 1 (1), line 6, 83, VZ to pay ATC 1 (1)	N	
E6051-403102952	10/11/2010	VZ	E	SCJPC	1. CORRECT TO READ 2. SEE JPA PRELIM ATTACHED 3. CHANGE LOCATION TO READ	Please stop clock this intent until e sends revision. No such location exists. Pag 2, line 13, OLIVE DR N/S 989 W/O L AV	N	
E6051-403102952	10/25/2010	E	VZ	SCJPC	none	Your F7 dated 9/23 and 10/1 2010 denied by SCE. SCE will not stop the clock and will not be sending a revision. Location does exist. Please refer to SCJPC records. Also this type of F7 does not warrant stoppage of the JPA by SCJPC.	N	
E6051-403223318	4/11/2011	VZ	E	SCJPC	ADD	Vz to add the following to intent to clear infractions caused by SCE setting new pole with disregard to prelim intent: item 89b, 89d, 91g, 91d, 91e. Please sign and return to VZ.	N	

E6051-403223318	4/14/2011	E	VZ/SCJPC	none	CORRECT TO READ	Items are denied, our setting of pole 4541245e benefit all party. S/S AVE 196' 1216' W/O RD 220 HARD SET	N	
E6051-403360789	10/25/2011	VZ	E	SCJPC	ADD & SEE PRELIMINARY ATTACHED	VZ to add the following item to intent. PG 1 Line 6, 1 item 89a terminal replacement. On Prelim intent VZ agreed to hard set on west side of old pole. New pole was not hard set.	N	
N/A	9/13/2011	E	VZ	none	CORRECT TO READ	Correction of Record (location only). Field verified.	N	Ask the other members if they approved it. Will be discussed in Jan 2012 RR meeting.
E6051-8782	3/18/2011	VZ	JPC	none	none	Please do not final bill this JPA until issues regarding pole number 4693873E have been resolved. Okay to process final bill as long as items 91b & 91C are on the final. The costs for these items are to be paid to Verizon (RG).	Y	
E6073-1385/402387722	9/22/2011	E	VZ	SCJPC	none	On referenced JPA page 2 line 2 under VZ Proposed, change VZ gr/spc from 26-4 to CLR 22 page 2 ln 5 remove section 7.4, page 2 ln 6 change PTD to under VZ, and page 2 line 7 remove item 19A 1/2 (1) under E.	N	
E6079-0578	4/22/2011	VZ	JPC	E	none	Please do not final bill this JPA until issues regarding this JPA have been resolved. Thank you. OK to bill as section 7.11 (YJ)	Y	
VZ5AW655506009	11/3/2011	E	VZ	none	Correct to read, see JPA preliminary attached	Note: This Form 7 received by post mail from VZ, not E. Please issue COR for subject JPA. VZ was advised via E's signed copy that pole 1551770E was an incorrect pole # (pole replaced 2007). Correct pole number: 4754901E, 75' Yr set 2007, FT, E-All, 66KV; location: Oaks st E/S S/O Riverside Dr 35'	N	
NPN-76446-04	4/15/2011	NPN	E/M/VZ	SCJPC/ATS/MCI/TWC	Correct to read	For Pole 1365556E, JPC record shows E&M Joint, it should be E&VZ joint. Agreement between M&VZ Pole card is incorrect. VZ is attached, not M. VZ is joint on all poles in that lead. If you have any questions, please contact CES, at 818-898-2352. Thank you.	N	

NXT-17081-014	10/26/2011	NXT	E/HLA	NG/SCJPC	Correct to read	Please remove 174844E from JPA. NXT-17081-014A will be issued to correct pole number and show NXT to purchase. If you have any questions, please call CES 818-898-2352	N	
VZ5AW17281006	9/9/2011	E	VZ	SCJPC		Please remove pole 4198901E from final bill. E denied attachment to this pole because of lack of safety clearance.	N	
VZ5AW651000090	10/31/2011	VZ				Original F7 shows Sec 18.1F notification from E to VZ. VZ notated: VZ to final.	N	
VZ5AW65580414	11/1/2011	VZ				Original F7 shows Sec 18.1F notification from E to VZ. VZ notated: VZ to final.	N	
VZ5AW65610417	10/28/2011	VZ				Original F7 shows Sec 18.1F notification from E to VZ. VZ notated: Sent final on 9/26/11 to JPP	N	