

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

January 10, 2012

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 9:40 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles
Ms. Lynne Prescott - Verizon Wireless
Ms. Janet Chirrick – 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 inquiring if there are any comments on the minutes of the prior meeting. Ms. Pranata stated that she would like the Form 7 to JPC guideline spreadsheet in the minutes as an attachment and reference for members. Ms. Corella will add the spreadsheet to the minutes and re-publish them on the website.

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. She inquired if any members had any comments or concerns. There was no discussion on this item.

The third issue on the agenda is **Item 1532: 18.1-F Form 48 Example**. Ms. Hernandez stated that the revised Form 48 has been board approved; however, this item remains open due to approval of the Section 18 Form 48 example. She added that she does not have the example ready at this time, therefore, this item will remain open.

The fourth item on the agenda is **Item 1537: Example 8 Revision**. The example refers to correction of record. Ms. Hernandez stated that one revision to the example is that prior the same JPA number is required, however, any number now will do. This decision is primarily based on the new system utilized by SCE where the same JPA number cannot be reassigned. She added that the original JPA number must be referenced in the nature of work and what is being corrected. The members extensively discussed the five year rule in regards to cost recovery and revising section 13. It was noted that the five year cost recovery rule applying to original COR JPA is predicated on the date it is received in the JPC office. A correction of record where no monies are involved is not limited to five years. The five year rule applies to

sections 13.1 and 13.2 in reference to monies owed or due. Section 13 is revised as well as example 8 pertaining to the section. It was agreed that the section revisions and the revised example 8 would be on the discussion calendar of the next administrative board meeting.

The fifth issue on the agenda is **Item 1539: Review of Section 4.0**. Mr. Chow requested tabling this issue. This item is on hold.

The sixth issue on the agenda is **Item 1540: Review of Changing Pole Location Process**. Ms. Hernandez opened by stating that in her opinion the notification of changing of a pole location should be via a JPA. This would allow the time frame and the approvals noted on the JPA, and if 45 days elapsed than the JPA could be finalized and the record corrected. Ms. Pranata stated that the Form 7 has a box for location correction. Ms. Hernandez stated that the location change on the Form 7 pertains to the location on the preliminary JPA. She added that the changing of pole location should not be sent to the JPC office via a Form 7, but the form transmitted between members in the preliminary process. It was noted that section 13 alludes to sending a Form 7 to the JPC office. It was agreed to revise the section in regards to the Form 7 reference. The revision will be on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting.

The seventh issue on the agenda is **Item 1542: Review of Section 16.1 Chart**. The members reviewed the chart and the issue is the safety clearance area on the 35 foot pole. Ms. Pranata stated that the billing associates were of the opinion that the SCZ for a 35 foot pole is 4 feet, and not aware that six feet is acceptable. She added that she would like clarification. After brief discussion it was agreed that it could be 4 or 6 feet SCZ. The chart was revised and will be on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting.

Lastly, the members discussed **miscellaneous items**.

Emergency JPA – Section 1.2

Ms. Hunter opened discussion by stating that he has a JPA with a special agreement and this is an emergency situation, therefore, he questioned if he is required to wait for signed approval. He further inquired if he could get approval from those members on the JPA who are in attendance. It was agreed since this is an emergency and a possible GO infraction to move forward with the transaction.

Clearance Pole Member – Authorized Cost

Ms. Pranata opened discussion on a situation of replacement on a clearance pole, section 9.4, and is it allowed to bill the clearance pole member an authorized cost? Ms. Hernandez responded if one is not an owner on a pole, there should be no charges. After brief discussion it was agreed that since the clearance party is not an owner on the pole there should be no authorized costs applicable.

Sections 7.11/5.1-A Mutually Exclusive

The next question Ms. Pranata brought to the table is can a replacement section 7.11 coincide with section 5.1-A on the same transaction. After some discussion, it was agreed that the two sections cannot coincide.

NG-SPR Purchase of Poles Identified

Ms. Haney opened discussion on the purchasing of poles from SPR and that NG has found as many as 1000 poles that SPR attached to and never purchased. This means that NG has acquired the fiber and is in the process of identifying the poles. She questioned if there is a simpler method of purchasing rather than processing a JPA. She reiterated that SPR never processed a purchase of interest JPA for these poles. Ms. Pearson stated that her group is discovering JPAs with poles that were replaced and SPR never purchased. She added that these JPAs are difficult and a great impact on resources. Ms Haney concluded that she is attempting to simplify the process in this instance.

NG-SPR Transfer of Ownership Poles

Ms. Henderson stated that in regards to the original agreement when NG acquired SPR assets it was agreed that it would be a simple change of ownership with no cost, however, her organization is expensing a great amount of resources to this NG-SPR simple project. Therefore, she is proposing an authorized cost for these rare instances. Ms. Pearson stated that she has encountered this type JPAs which originally should be a simple transfer of ownership is proving a convoluted and complex operation. Ms. Hernandez added that although the members agreed on this transfer of ownership at no cost to the members, members are finding that this type project is costly and drains resources. Therefore, moving forward Ms. Hernandez is of the opinion that this type of transfer should flow through the JPA process where one owner relinquishes and the other owner purchases. The members agreed that an item number should be assigned to this issue for discussion and resolution. It was agreed to assign **Item 1546: Transfer of Ownership Administrative Costs** to the Authorized Costs Elements ad hoc committee for further discussion.

Five year Inspection limit/Retagging

Ms. Hernandez raised question on the five year inspection limit. She questioned if the five years are effective after the initial inspection. It was agreed that there is ambiguity in regards to the five year inspection clause and that this issue requires greater thought and discussion. This issue will be discussed further at the next ad hoc meeting. Next, Ms. Hernandez questioned if there should be a limit on the instances a pole is retagged. Ms. Pranata stated that pole tagging is not recorded on the pole card, therefore, there is no method of tracking the last date a pole was tagged. Mr. Chow stated pole tagging is aligned with inspections. If a pole is inspected and the tag is missing, the pole is retagged. The issue will be discussed further if necessary at a future meeting.

Storm damage pole replacement

Mr. Hunter questioned if there is a section for replacement due to storm damage. Ms. Hernandez responded that there is no section for storm damage replacement, although, she is of the opinion that one would be beneficial. Mr. Hunter added that there should be a section to address anchor storm damage as well as pole damage. It was agreed to assign **Item 1547: Disaster Pole and Anchor Replacement** to this ad hoc for further discussion.

Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts.

- Item 1537 for discussion calendar
- Item 1540 for discussion calendar
- Item 1542: for discussion calendar

The meeting adjourned at 12.45 p.m. until February 14, 2012.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

Attachment

CORRECTION OF RECORD / CANCELLATION

13.0 Cancellation

Cancellation of Joint Pole Authorization where any construction expense has been incurred by owner of pole may not be made without the consent of Members concerned. Where no expense has been incurred, the Member desiring cancellation shall immediately notify other Members concerned by forwarding a Form 7 showing Joint Pole Authorization number and location, but omitting the details of transactions.

13.1 Correction of Record/Cost Recovery

Correction of error in recorded data or any other detail shall be made on Joint Pole Authorization and, where necessary, adjustment for price shall be made in accordance with date of Joint Pole Authorization that has been found to be in error. (See Example 8, Page 18-13) Recorded interests in conflict with the Routine shall not be corrected, except with the consent of all Members concerned, until pole is replaced, or an incoming Member desires to purchase interest, or one joint owner wishes to relinquish interest.

~~The Committee shall issue a new record for all corrections except those relating to pole locations. Member noting error in location of pole shall correct its record and advise other joint owners and the Committee by Form 7 J/P Memorandum of~~

~~necessary correction (Deleted per RR meeting 01/10/2012)(Revised August 2011).~~

Cost allocation shall also be authorized, where required, for reinstatement of record or any other detail in which a completed transaction is in error for five (5) years from the bill of sale date unless otherwise negotiated by special agreement. (See Section 1.2) (Revised October 2011).Effective January 2012.

13.2 Refund

Refund of full purchase price may be authorized when attachment has not been made and no construction expense has been incurred by owner of pole or equipment involved. Refund shall also be authorized, where required, for reinstatement of record or any other detail in which a completed transaction is in error for five (5) years from the bill of sale date unless otherwise negotiated by special agreement. (See Section 1.2)

13.3 Update Record per Field Conditions

Joint Pole Authorization or Form 7 issued to update recorded data per field conditions. If a Form 7 is issued, it needs to be submitted to the Joint Pole Committee.

Note: Section 13.3 is a non-billable section. (Revised January 2009).

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

February 14, 2012

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 10:00 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Dennis Ennis – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Shawn Henderson – T-Mobile USA (teleconference)
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Steve Brown – City of Los Angeles - DWP
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California
Mr. Michael Wolf – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)
Ms. Tracey Province – Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Mr. Ryan Jones – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting with introductions. She then inquired if there are any comments on the minutes of the prior meeting. Mr. Eastwood requested to have his name removed from the attendance roster, and Ms. Prescott requested the E dropped from the end of her name. The revisions were noted and will be corrected.

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. She inquired if any members had any comments or concerns. There was no discussion on this item.

The third issue on the agenda is **Item 1532: 18.1-F Form 48 Example**. Ms. Hernandez reported that she has not reviewed the Form 48 example provided by Mr. Walls, therefore, she requested this item remain open and tabled for the next Routine meeting.

The fourth issue on the agenda is **Item 1539: Review of Section 4.0**. Ms. Hernandez reported that issue was brought to the table by Mr. Chow. She added that he has requested this item tabled until he is prepared to open discussion on the topic.

The fifth issue on the agenda is **Item 1540: Review of Changing Pole Location Process**. This item was returned from the last Board meeting for rework. Ms. Hernandez stated that she is of the opinion that further discussion is required to clarify that a Form 7 should not be used to change record location of a pole. She added that a Form 7 can be issued to correct location on a pole that is in the preliminary JPA process. She further added that the differentiation requires clarification. She added that the use of the Form 7 for changing pole location during the preliminary process is referenced in Section 18.1-C (a) and it need not be changed. Section 18, Example 4 titled, “Form 7 Joint Pole Memorandum” will be revised by adding the following verbiage: JPA number is required, and must be in process or pending. It was agreed to place this item number on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting.

The sixth issue on the agenda is **Item 1547: Disaster Pole & Anchor Replacement Section**. This issue pertains to creating a section that addresses replacing poles and anchors due to natural disasters such as wind and rain storms. Currently, section 7.6 addresses plant damages due to third parties, but not natural disasters. The ad hoc committee agreed that an additional section which address natural disasters would prove beneficial. It was agreed to add a subsection to section 7.6 to address natural disasters. The members collaborated on the verbiage for subsections A and B. The consensus is to place sections 7.6-A & B on the discussion calendar of the next Administrative Board meeting. (see attachment).

Lastly, the members discussed **miscellaneous items**.

Obsolete Member Codes

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion by inquiring if a JPA is initiated in a current year, is it correct to accept this JPA with an obsolete member code? Ms. Corella and Ms. Pranata stated that there are some members who submit their finalized JPAs and do not use their member code when assigning the JPA a number. Example members cited are City of Riverside whose member code is “J”, uses “CR”, and Golden State Water whose member code is “SCW”, uses “BV”. The JPC office has always accepted these JPAs since they are able to identify the member. It was agreed that when iPAM is implemented, members will be allowed only the use of one member code. The system will not recognize obsolete and unknown member codes. Ms. Hernandez stated for the sake of consistency, members should utilize only one member code. After brief discussion, it was agreed to place this issue on the Unknown Items section on the agenda of the next Board meeting.

Correction JPA lacking “COR” extension

Ms. Pranata opened discussion by stating that the JPC office is receiving correction of record JPAs and they are lacking the “COR” extension required to be added to the JPA number. Ms. Pranata stated the JPAs were issued prior to the implementation of the COR requirement. Her question is whether the JPC office is allowed to accept this type JPAs or return to the initiator. Ms. Hernandez responded to process the said JPAs since the body of the JPA notes Correction of Record.

Temporary Attachments

The next question Ms. Pranata brought to the table regarded temporary attachments. She received a temporary attachment stating it should be removed by a specific date, and according to records it remains a temporary attachment. The answer was that the original temporary attachment JPA initiator is responsible for correcting the temporary attachments. Her question is whose responsibility is it to correct a temporary attachment. Ms. Pranata inquired should the temporary owner now purchase the space? Ms. Hernandez responded that the time for temporary attachment has expired and the space should be purchased 4.0.

Multiple JPA "COR" Extensions

Ms. Pearson opened discussion concerning how many correction of records with the extension "COR" is allowed. She added that her organization has been receiving correction JPAs with "COR1, COR2, COR3 and so on correcting the same JPA but multiple errors. She added that she has returned the JPA requesting that the JPA be revised and combine all corrections on one JPA. The response she received was negative to revising and combining on one JPA. She reiterated, how many "COR" extension JPAs are acceptable. The members discussed this issue in that there is nothing in the Routine that addresses it. During the discussion, it appeared that these multiple corrections are related to the mandate pole inspection sheets received from various members on the same poles. Ms. Pearson stated that the corrections were mainly to correct space and grades. Ms. Hernandez stated that one option is to create a JPA with 13.3 to correct record per field conditions. It was suggested to publish a JPA alert to read, "if you are correcting space and grade and there is no monetary result, issue a JPA per Section 13.3". After discussion Ms. Hernandez suggested forming a committee to address the review of inspections from other members. To this, Ms. Haney proposed changing the title of the Pole Loading committee to Compliance Committee. Ms. Hernandez agreed and stated that this type of inspection and requests can be brought to the Compliance committee for review, discussion, and resolution. The final consensus is to postpone the JPA alert and change the title of the pole loading committee to compliance committee.

JPA Final Billed out of sequential order

Ms. Hernandez presented an issue of an NG initiated JPA sent to M, and H. She added that neither M nor H notified NG that there is an pending ATC JPA. She further added that unaware of the outstanding JPA, NG final billed the JPA; ATC cannot final bill their since NG reflects as an owner She stated that this issue is occurring often. Although, she has the right to request NG to create a correcting JPA; this would not be necessary if the other owning members had alerted NG about the pending ATC JPA. This situation is creating additional work on the member that holds the pending JPA. Ms. Hernandez inquired if there is a simple resolution of processing this pending JPA. After brief discussion, it was agreed that there is no simple resolution and the method now in place is required. To this, Ms. Hernandez stressed to the members that they notify their respective staff that it is imperative to remind members that there is a pending JPA. Ms. Hernandez and Ms. Haney came to an agreement regarding this particular JPA.

Pole App versus JPAs

Ms. Hernandez presented a situation where H received a pole application from Freedom, H approved the application, however; ATC had a JPA pending a year prior to the Freedom application for the same space. Freedom moved ATC's facilities from the space without any notice. She added that she believes member should have a process in place so that the JPA departments and the pole lease application departments communicate to deter this instance from occurring again. Mr. Eastwood added that his organization has encountered problems with Freedom attaching prior to approval. Freedom's construction contractor appears to be jeopardizing the business relationship with SCE.

Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts.

- Item 1540 for discussion calendar
- Item 1547: for discussion calendar
- Obsolete member codes on Unknown portion of Board calendar

The meeting adjourned at 11.45 a.m. until March 13, 2012.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

Attachment

7.6 A. Replacement of Pole Due to Damage Caused by Any Person, Firm or Corporation Which Is Not a Party to the Joint Pole Agreement

The Member replacing pole shall sell interest to each Member concerned. Each Member shall receive salvage on maximum value recoverable and shall pay pulling and transportation. Each Member shall transfer its facilities and shall bill party responsible for the damage for its share of the net cost of replacement.

Emergency pole installation is where the pole must be replaced immediately: The joint owner(s) must be notified by telephone of emergency installations within 24 hours by setting Member. Setting Member must issue Form 2 Preliminary within 45 calendar days from date of pole replacement, otherwise Section 7.13 will apply. Telephone notification must be confirmed by either Form 2 or Form 48 showing, if known:

- (a) Time and date of accident
- (b) Time and date joint owner notified
- (c) Name of person notified
- (d) Police report number

In cases where the urgency for new pole installation is not immediate, notification rules of this section will still apply, however the rules of 7.11 will be followed to determine “**proposed**” purchase in new pole. (Revised January 2007)

7.6 B. Replacement of Pole Due to Natural Causes (Storm, Catastrophe)

The Member replacing pole shall sell interest to each Member concerned. Each Member shall receive salvage on maximum value recoverable and shall pay pulling and transportation. Each Member shall transfer its facilities.

Emergency pole installation is where the pole must be replaced immediately: The joint owner(s) must be notified by telephone of emergency installations within 24 hours by setting Member. Setting Member must issue Form 2 Preliminary with date and identification of natural cause (Form 48 may be attached).

In cases where the urgency for new pole installation is not immediate, notification rules of this section will still apply, however the rules of 7.11 will be followed to determine “**proposed**” purchase in new pole (Added January 2012).

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

March 13, 2012

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 10:00 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Dennis Ennis – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Shawn Henderson – T-Mobile USA (teleconference)
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Steve Brown – City of Los Angeles - DWP
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California
Mr. Michael Wolf – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)
Ms. Tracey Province – Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Mr. Ryan Jones – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting at 10:00 am. She then inquired if there are any comments on the minutes of the prior meeting. In that the minutes were sent earlier to the attendees for their review, there were no comments 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. This issue addresses any foreign JPAs that should be and are not yet finalized. She reminded the members that it was decided at prior meetings that a JPA may be final billed even if construction is not complete to reflect purchasing the space. She inquired if any members had any other comments or concerns. There was no discussion on this item.

The third issue on the agenda is **Item 1532: 18.1-F Form 48 Example**. The members again reviewed the latest revision of the Form 48. After brief discussion, it was agreed to add another column to the form titled “ADD item #.

The Form 48 will be on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting to notify members that an additional column has been added to the form. The members then discussed and created example 20 to add to Section 18 to reflect a diagram example of how the Form 48 should be completed (see attachment II).

The fourth issue on the agenda is **Item 1539: Review of Section 4.0**. Mr. Chow requested that this item remain open, however to be tabled at this time.

The fifth issue on the agenda is **Item 1540: Review of Changing Pole Location Process**. This item was returned to this ad hoc for further work. An example using the Form 7 for changing pole location while in preliminary process is to be created. Ms. Hernandez stated that this item will be tabled at this time.

Lastly, the members discussed **miscellaneous items**.

Section 18.1-B Changes Prior to Approval

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion by stating that it was brought to her attention that she is not following the Routine in regards to the above mentioned section. She stated that other members also are not following this section. She added that either members must start following the Routine, or change this section to reflect what is transpiring. Ms. Hernandez further stated that currently, her organization signs the JPA, but does not strike out the signature of the issuing member when they return the JPA. If the issuer does not agree they issue a Form 7. If they agree no action is taken. After extensive discussion amongst the members, it was decided to revise the section verbiage to reflect how this action is currently processed (see attachment I). This item will be on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting.

Relinquish footage.

Ms. Province questioned if a member is at 22-5, and they now only require two feet, how does one relinquish the unnecessary footage. Ms. Hernandez responded that this would be reflected on the proposed side of the JPA with no compensation unless another member desires to purchase the footage. If not, the footage reverts back to the base owner. Ms. Hernandez suggested maintaining the additional footage and when the pole is replaced note on the proposed side of the JPA only the footage now required.

Form 9

Ms. Haney questioned when setting a strand mounted antenna and a Form 9 is issued to indicate a riser, will NG be faulted for not issuing a 3.1

JPA. She added that she wants to ensure that NG is within Routine since the antenna is not on the pole. Mr. Eastwood responded if NG is receiving resistance from members in this instance. Ms. Haney responded that she is not, however, just wanted clarification. Mr. Hunter stated that by placing a strand mounted antenna, due to the two foot antenna and the two foot safety clearance, this situation is taking four feet of usable footage. The members discussed this and it was decided that a JPA is not necessary. However, it was suggested that this topic warrants further discussion in depth.

PTX - SCZ

Mr. Hunter requested clarification on PTX and billing. His staff had PTX JPAs returned and is questioning where the error is. Ms. Pranata responded that the billing question from her staff is the SCZ issue. Ms. Hernandez clarified that when power is attaching a PTX, they need only purchase the one foot, and the staff not concern themselves with safety clearance, since it should be assumed that power has met the clearance requirement which has been created by the PTX.

JPA out of sequential order

Ms. Pranata reported that she received a JPA out of order, thus not matching what is on record. Ms. Hernandez responded that the JPA should be returned. It is incumbent on the initiating member to verify the pole records via the pole data base versus the preliminary.

Pole Applications/Communication

Ms. Hernandez questioned when sending a Form 9, is the form sent to all owners on the pole. Currently, she is sending the form to the party in her lease agreement only. Mr. Eastwood responded it is the leasers' responsibility to notify other members.

Ms. Prescott added that when this form is sent to the leasers', there have been instances where the other owning members are not aware of the pole application and riser notification, thus creating a problem. She added that all members should be aware of the plans of a pole application for a specific pole. Mr. Chow stated that he agrees that owners on a pole should be aware of tenant applications. He added that the issue of good communication amongst members is paramount; that members should be aware of fellow member's intentions for a pole(s), which includes tenant's actions. The CPUC is of the opinion that members should be fully aware of what their peer intentions are for pole transactions on joint poles. Therefore, this issue of communication in regards to tenants warrants further discussion. It was suggested that the responsibility of communication to all member's party to the pole, should be incumbent on the pole application initiator.

It was decided that this issue would be assigned to the ad hoc Compliance Committee for further discussion. **Item 1549: Pole Application Notification** has been assigned to the Compliance Committee.

Tenant sublease

Ms. Hernandez inquired if a tenant applying for space on a pole, is that tenant allowed to sublease. Mr. Chow responded that this would depend on the leaser and the license agreement. Per SCE tenants cannot sublease. Mr. Hunter stated that currently as a lessee, his organization has idle black fiber that his organization would like to lease. Mr. Chow responded that the lessee could lease the equipment, since the lessee is attached to the pole and the fiber is equipment, and the lessee is allowed to lease his equipment, but not allowed another entity to attach to the pole. In summation, it is the equipment that is being leased not the pole space. However, it was agreed that generally subleasing is not allowed.

Temporary Pole Attachment Recorded

Ms. Pearson brought a JPA situation to the table regarding temporary attachment. She stated that a 2009 JPA was submitted to the JPC office for 2011 billing, however, when the JPA was billed the attachment had already been removed. The JPC office informed Ms. Pearson that since there no record and there no longer is a temp attachment there is no need to record now. However, Ms. Pearson would like a pole record created and then a dead record for historical tracking/claims purposes. It was decided that in this type situation a record of this transaction should be created.

Mismatched Pole year set and location

Ms. Pearson opened stating the foreign JPAs SCE has been receiving have the pole year set and location in disagreement with their solely owned poles on their records. She added that there is no notation on the JPA that it is per field condition. Ms. Hernandez responded that if her organization does not know the year set they notate SCE to provide this info on the JPA. As for location, it is taken from the strand map. They do not contact SCE for this info if there is enough info to create a JPA. Mr. Chow reported that with the SCE SAP system, it is difficult to change data even if the new data is accurate. Ms. Pearson added that this issue is consuming SCE resources. The members discussed scenarios for resolution; however, it was decided to discuss the issue further.

Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts.

- Item 1540 for discussion calendar
- Item 1547: for discussion calendar
- Obsolete member codes on Unknown portion of Board calendar

The meeting adjourned at 12.05 p.m. until April 10, 2012.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

Attachment I

18.1-B Changes Prior to Approval

Any changes desired prior to approval of Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization by the receiving Member shall be made by means of the following procedure:

(A) Receiving Member:

- (1) Make desired change
- (2) Sign amended form
- ~~(3) Strike out signature of issuing member~~
- (4) Return copy to issuing Member

(B) Issuing Member:

(1) If change is acceptable:

- ~~(a) Sign and date in area of deleted signature and return copy(s) to receiving member(s).~~
- (b) No actions take place. Process form in normal manner

(2) If change is unacceptable:

- (a) Communicate ~~by telephone and/or meet in field~~ with receiving Member(s) representative(s) to resolve differences by either issuing Form 7 or revising the JPA.
- (b) ~~Any further revisions must be made within fifteen days of receipt or the change will be considered approved. If no agreement can be reached, either Member may bring it to the Administrative Board for possible resolutions.~~
- (c) If subsequent changes occur, refer to the standard procedure for Form 7 usage. (See Section 18.4)
- ~~(d) If no agreement can be reached either Member may initiate arbitration by forwarding a Form 7 notifying the Committee office that a protest has been filed. A copy of the form must be forwarded to the other participating Members (s) on the same day the protest is filed. The authorization will then be held until agreement is reached in accordance with arbitration procedures.~~

(3) Multi-Party JPAs:

The initiator of a multi-party JPA will be responsible for notifying all involved parties of any changes made to that JPA prior to final approval.

An acceptable method for the initiating member to notify all involved parties of any changes made to a JPA includes sending a Form 7 indicating

“See Changes” with a copy of the marked-up Form 2 Preliminary JPAs as an attachment. (Revised January 2011).

[JPA Alert when approved & Effective Date: 2013 Routine Handbook](#)

Attachment II

FORM 48

MEMORANDUM NOTICE OF JOINT POLE WORK

IMPORTANT - Note correct Operation and provide details accurately.

FIELD USE: FORM 48 DATE PREPARED: _____ JPA NUMBER: _____

OFFICE USE: FORM 48 DATE SENT: _____ JPA DATE SENT: _____

UTILITY CODE

From: _____ Name: _____ Phone number: _____

UTILITY CODE

UTILITY CODE

To: _____	Name: _____	To: _____	Name: _____
To: _____	Name: _____	To: _____	Name: _____
To: _____	Name: _____	To: _____	Name: _____
To: _____	Name: _____	To: _____	Name: _____
To: _____	Name: _____	To: _____	Name: _____

OPERATION No.

1. Change removal agreement.
2. Add item for hand-dig, **specify nature of conflict in remarks.**
3. Add item for topping a pole, **when not on JPA.**
4. Transfer has been completed.
5. Make your temporary attachments permanent on new pole.
6. Anchor has been installed/replaced; attachments should be made.
7. Our attachments have been removed; pole may be renumbered (**only applies to base owner**).
8. New pole location changed, specify nature of conflict and new location in remarks (**substructure conflict on**).
9. Our transfer has been completed; pole may be pulled (**i.e. MITC poles, alternative to wood poles**).
10. All work completed based on Form 7 dated: _____
11. Work completed **ONLY** on poles listed below.
12. Our work has been completed. **Must list poles below.**
13. Records only-Initiate billing (**purchase/relinquishment**).

POLE LEGEND:
 P = PULL
 PB = PULL BUTT
 T = TRANSPORT
 S = SALVAGE
 D = DISPOSE
 TN = TENANT

L = LOWER TOP
U(XX) = UTILITY CODE (FO)
SCZ = SAFETY CLEARANCE

ANCHOR/ARM LEGEND:
AR = ANCHOR/ARM REMOVED
AT = ANCHOR/ARM TRANSFER

J.P. Auth.		Pole No. (Required)	Operation No. (Required)	Utility Code				POLE CUT U(XX)	ADD Item #	Remarks/changes
				PTD	PB	LTD	HAND DIG			
Page No.	Line No.									

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

April 10, 2012

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, at 12:50 p.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Dennis Ennis – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Shawn Henderson – T-Mobile USA (teleconference)
Ms. Tracey Province – Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Steve Brown – City of Los Angeles - DWP
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Michael Wolf – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath (teleconference)
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Mr. Ryan Jones – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting at 12:50 pm. She then addressed the first issue on the agenda; the review of the prior month's meeting. She noted one error on page 2. The minutes will be revised to correct the error. There were no further 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 is addressed at every meeting. This issue pertains to any foreign JPAs that should be and are not yet finalized. She added that some members now send a Form 7 for individual JPAs that are not final billed.

The third issue on the agenda is **Item 1539: Review of Section 4.0**. Ms. Hernandez suggested tabling this issue until Mr. Chow is in attendance.

Lastly, the members discussed **miscellaneous items**.

Section 18.1-B Changes Prior to Approval

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion by stating that this issue has been returned from the last board meeting discussion calendar for minor rework. Ms. Prescott suggested adding the word “additional” to (B) -1-b. The members had no issue with this addition. After extension discussion, the members continued reviewing the revision to Section 18.1-B and added additional revisions. The final draft would be placed on the Consent Calendar of the next Board meeting (see attachment for final draft). This section is now referenced in Section 18.4.

Ms. Hernandez stated that she would like to discuss section 18.1-B (3), multi-party JPAs. She continued that it is the responsibility of the initiating party to ensure all members’ party to the JPA become aware of all changes. She added that she would to remind all members’ of this procedure since many members today are neglecting to notify all members party to the JPA of any changes.

Ms. Hernandez then proposed a revision to Section 13.3. The members reviewed the proposed revision. Minor changes were made to the revised proposal, and the final draft was agreed by the members. This revised section will be on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting (see attachment II).

Lastly, Mr. Hunter posed the question if a member is changing the type pole from wood to an alternative pole type, can this change be communicated via a Form 7. Mr. Brown added if this change could be noted on the Form 48. Ms. Hernandez responded that it could noted on the Form 48, however, the receiving members will pay only the wood pole price, and not the alternative to pole price. Mr. Hunter added that the alternative pole would be only composite fiberglass and/or steel. Ms. Hernandez responded that if there is no re-engineering required, it is not a problem. However, if it requires re-engineering the Form 7 response time is only 15 days, and not enough time for the receiving party. However, with a revision to the JPA would give the receiving party a 45 day response time. Mr. Hunter reiterated that the alterative pole type would likely be fiberglass.

Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts.

- Section 18.1-B for discussion calendar
- Section 13.3 for discussion calendar

The meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m. until May 8, 2012.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

Attachment I

18.1-B Changes Prior to Approval-04/18/2012 For Admin Board Discussion next week.

Any changes desired prior to approval of Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization by the receiving Member shall be made by means of the following procedure:

- (A) Receiving Member:
 - (1) Make desired change
 - (2) Sign amended form
 - (4) Return copy to issuing Member
- (B) Issuing Member:
 - (1) If change is acceptable:
 - (a)
 - (b) No additional actions take place. Process form in normal manner.
 - (2) If change is unacceptable:
 - (a) Communicate with receiving Member(s) representative(s) to resolve differences by either issuing Form 7 or revising the JPA.

(c) Until differences are resolved, issue the Form 7 to all participating Member(s), CC to SCJPC, not to process JPA Final Bill.

(b) If subsequent changes occur, refer to the standard procedure for Form 7 usage. (See Section 18.4)

(d) Any Member may request a resolution meeting with the Administrative Board by issuing the Form 7 to all participating Member(s), CC to SCJPC.

(3) Multi-Party JPAs:

The initiator of a multi-party JPA will be responsible for notifying all involved parties of any changes made to that JPA prior to final approval.

An acceptable method for the initiating member to notify all involved parties of any changes made to a JPA includes sending a Form 7 indicating "See Changes" with a copy of the marked-up Form 2 Preliminary JPAs as an attachment. (Revised January 2011).

JPA Alert when approved & Effective Date: 2013
Routine Handbook

Attachment II

13.3 Update Record per Field Conditions

Joint Pole Authorization issued to update recorded data per field conditions.

Correction of an error in recorded joint pole location data shall be made on a Joint Pole Authorization and shall be corrected upon JPA approval. Utilize section 13.3 and include a note in the nature of work that it is a location correction. If a pending JPA for the pole already exists, the change can be made on a Form 7 and submitted to the other joint Members concerned (see Section 18, Example 4).

Note: Section 13.3 is a non-billable section.
(Revised April 2012).

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE
279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone (909) 599-3801

June 12, 2012

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

Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Steve Brown – City of Los Angeles – DWP
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)
Mr. Michael Wolf – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Shawn Henderson– T-Mobile USA
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Mr. Ryan Jones – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff
Mr. Kyle Levy – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened the meeting with, **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. Mr. Hunter presented the issue of incorrect pole information of solely owned poles on a JPA. Examples of errors being made were pole height, location, voltage, and treatment. Being that these are solely owned poles the initiating party would need to go to the owner of the solely owned pole to retrieve this information, which isn't always being done. It was noted that locations could sometimes differ because of measuring points, but as long as the individual in the field had the year set, height, and treatment in theory there would be no need to contact the owner for any information. The problem was presented on the purchase of interest on solely owned poles, the base owner having to change their records based on what comes in on the JPA. Mr. Hunter presented the idea of a solely owned database. Mr. Chow is of the opinion that a company such as SPIDA which could talk to multiple systems in real time would be a better solution. The consensus was to proceed with business as usual. Ms. Hernandez reported on the subject of Cell Site JPA's, issuing a form 48 would with the date the site was on air, wait 15 days, and if no response will be billed prior to the 45 days. It was agreed that this was acceptable to expedite the process of said JPA's.

The second issue on the agenda is **Item 1539: Review of section 4.0**. Ms. Hernandez stated that some JPA's have sections 4.0, 7.11, 5.0 etc. She made the case for to have JPA's with section 4.0 to be separate. This is pertaining to record only JPA's where work is completed after the final bill. Ms. Hernandez presented the question of would companies like to know when an antenna is completed. It was the consensus that this would best benefit the members since the California Public Utility Commission was adamant about communication between utilities when attaching to poles. Mr. Chow stated that from compliance perspective utilities would need to know when the work was completed for work that was purchased earlier. Mr. Wolf made a suggestion of distinguishing between a 4.0 that is buying additional space versus buying the first communication space. It was agreed that this could prove useful; using 4.0A & 4.0B was suggested. Ms. Hernandez requested that this be tabled for the next routine meeting for further discussion.

Lastly, the members discussed **miscellaneous items**.

Clearance Pole

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion inquiring if any miscellaneous issues to be address. Mr. Levy presented a JPA in which a clearance pole is being replaced with a standard joint pole, can the item numbers be charged. The consensus was that without knowing what is out in the field it would be hard to determine, it was also consensus that clearance poles generally are replaced by clearance poles. It was agreed that even though it was wrong that is not the committee staff's job to do quality control on the JPA's. It was also the consensus that the JPA's would be billed, and the initiator would issue a correction of records if there was a discrepancy.

Unauthorized Attachment to Anchors

Ms. Prescott inquired initiating an authorized cost for illegal attachment to anchors, not only for illegal attachments but also for under guying. It was agreed to further discuss this item in the next Routine Revision meeting under **item 1554: Unauthorized attachments to anchor**.

Sharing Pole Card Information with Caltrans

Mr. Eastwood suggested that discussion be opened on the sharing pole information with Caltrans. He stated that he had been in communication with them regarding accepting pole records from the JPC. It was agreed to further discuss this in the Admin Board meeting.

Review of Action items/JPA Alerts.

- Internally think about section 4.0; Pros & Cons to 4.0(a)(b)
- Edison to look into an email address for E-all Poles

Then Meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m. until July 10, 2012.

Ryan Jones, Committee Staff

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE
279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone (909) 599-3801

August 14, 2012

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

Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Steve Brown – City of Los Angeles – DWP
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless (teleconference)
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California
Ms. Tracey Province – Verizon California
Ms. Jennifer Navarro – (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Mr. Kyle Levy – Committee Staff
Mr. Ryan Jones – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened by inquiring if there were any questions or concerns regarding the previous meeting minutes, there were none.

The second item on the agenda was **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. Ms. Hernandez stated that this was a standing agenda item and was to be discussed at every meeting. Ms. Pearson stated that section 18.1D when pulled up electronically has a link for clarification that is not in the hard copy of the routine handbook, she inquired if this should be added to the hard copy of the Routine Handbook and requested further explanation of the clarification. Since the clarification only states written or verbal communication it was asked if a form 7 would suffice as a signed copy. Ms. Hernandez stated that once the 45 days has passed and a signed copy was sent prior to start of construction be it on the 47th day or 100th day 18.1D would not be applicable and the member's information should be in the header. Ms. Hernandez further stated if a form 7 was sent back and forth making changes that this would be enough to qualify as a signature agreeing to the JPA. Ms. Pearson made a point that if it was just the fact of the header information being on the JPA it would look like that JPA was agreed upon within the 45 days. Ms. Province inquired if a member was able to call as a form of communication to ask for the JPA to not be 18.1D because that member is planning to send approval. The consensus was that

there should be written notification of such inquiries. The members discussed if a signed form 2 was sent prior to the beginning of construction the header information would be used but there would need to be a way to note that the form 2 was not approved within the 45 days. Ms. Hernandez requested that out of respect and courtesy as partners, should the signed copy be received after the 45-days but before construction start the approval header information be added to the final without the 18.1D. Ultimately, it is the initiators decision to use the approval information or the 18.1D.

It was decided to delete the 18.1D clarification form the routine handbook and move it to the JPA alert.

Mr. Chow then presented a situation where JPAs are being sent out on one-sided legal but are being returned printed double-sided legal; he asked that this be looked into by members to see if this can be corrected.

The third issue on the agenda was **Item 1539: Review of section 4.0**. Due to all members' requirement to keep pole loading documents on every pole the consensus was to not final bill until attached. The members agreed that this item be closed.

The fourth issue of the agenda was **Item 1554: Unauthorized Attachments to Anchor**. Ms. Prescott discussed tenants having unauthorized attachments to another member's anchors. Ms. Prescott suggested the members with the tenant purchase interest in the anchor(s). It was noted that if an unauthorized anchor cost were to be created the cost would be incurred by the tenant owners. Ms. Hernandez noted that members need to start capturing tenant attachment to anchors and initiate JPAs indicating what was found in the field. The consensus was that a JPA alert be created reminding members to issue JPAs if they find a jointly owned anchor that is not on record. The members agreed that this item be closed.

The fifth issue of the agenda was **Item 1556: Violation of Routine Notifications**. Mr. Chow reminded the Members that item pertains to guying or pole loading deficiencies found in the normal course of business and not associated to an inspection as specified in Rule 18. Mr. Chow then presented a form (see attached) that could potentially be used to communicate outside Rule 18 avenue via the JPA process. It was agreed that this be tabled for the next meeting.

Lastly, the members discussed **miscellaneous items**.

Non Constructed Pole Loads

Ms. Hernandez opened discussion inquiring if any miscellaneous issues to be address. Mr. Hunter presented a hypothetical situation where a communication company purchases interest but doesn't construct for couple years, another company a year later issues a JPA to purchase interest. He questioned whether the pole loading should be calculated with the company's cable specs that have yet to attach. He presented a situation where the newest company takes the pole load to 99% capacity but the company that reserved space first needs to upgrade their cable causing the pole to fail, which is responsible for replacing that pole. It was agreed that the last company to attach would be at fault for the overload and would be required to

replace the pole in question. It was also agreed that pole loading should be done for all changes planned to the pole whether they occur or not.

JPA Multiple Column Use

Mr. Levy presented a situation where a member is using 3 columns for grade and space. He inquired if this was necessary or if this could be consolidated to 1 column. The consensus was that all members should be using a single column for grade and space. Ms. Hernandez stated that JPC staff should return all JPAs in question.

Tenants Attached to other owners

Mr. Eastwood stated that he was encountering incidents where Edison's tenants were attached to another owner's space. He went on, stating that Edison has begun to send letters to the tenants giving them the option to: move back into Edison's space, apply to the other company, or pay Edison to purchase that space. He inquired if other members were experiencing the same situations.

Correction of records over 5 years

Ms. Hernandez presented a situation where a Correction of records JPA was issued for a JPA that was originally issued in 2004. The pole was replaced, but it was the wrong pole. She questioned if that correction of records should have been refunded. Ms. Pranata inquired how the committee staff would differentiate if a correction of records should be refunded. It was agreed that section 1.2 special agreement would be added to the JPA indicating to the staff that credit applies.

Dead pole records that still exist in field

Mr. Chow inquired about poles along Arrow Highway which Edison's records show the poles as existing joint poles with E, VZ and ATC, yet Joint Pole Committee shows them dead. He further explained that JPAs were backlogged because of this and inquired if a record would be created if Edison submitted their record of the poles. It was agreed that the members on the poles would further research the pole numbers in question to try and find a copy of the JPA.

Review of Action items/JPA Alerts.

- Delete clarification of section 18.1D
- JPA alert on Joint anchors not on record
- JPA alert on single column use for each company

Then Meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m. until September 11, 2012.

Ryan Jones, Committee Staff

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE
279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone (909) 599-3801

September 11, 2012

A meeting of the Routine Revision Committee took place on the above date, at 10:00 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Shawn Henderson– T-Mobile USA
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Steve Brown – City of Los Angeles – DWP
Ms. Debbie Wooten – NextG Network
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California
Ms. Tracey Province – Verizon California
Mr. Mr. Michael Wolf – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Jennifer Navarro – (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Mr. Kyle Levy – Committee Staff
Mr. Ryan Jones – Committee Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened by inquiring if there were any questions or concerns regarding the previous meeting minutes, there were none.

The second item on the agenda was **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. Ms. Hernandez stated that this was a standing agenda item and was to be discussed at every meeting. Ms. Hernandez inquired if there were any questions or concerns. There were none and this topic is to be tabled until next meeting.

The third issue on the agenda was **Item 1556: Violation of Routine Notification Form**. Ms. Hernandez reopened discussion on the creation of a form to notify members of non conformance found in the normal course of work. Ms. Hernandez inquired if this form was created would it be necessary for the GO95 infraction to be notated on the JPA as well. It was agreed that the form would be used if the pole in question is not associated with a JPA, and that it would be noted in the nature of work section if the pole was on a JPA in transaction. Ms. Wooten inquired about the length in time in which the non-conformance was found and the time the form was sent. Mr. Chow stated that since this was not Rule 18 it should not be subject to the 10 days, the form would be filed in regular course of business. It was agreed that the form be

named Form 11 (notice of GO95 non-conformance) and be added to the agenda under discussions for the October Administrative Board meeting. The Members also agreed to revise Section 18 to show Form 11 and to remove Form 8.

Lastly, the members discussed **miscellaneous items**.

Mr. Chow reopened discussion the subject of 18.1D and the signature being replaced if a signed copy was sent after the 45 days but prior to construction. He notified members that his company is currently following that process.

Mr. Chow inquired if 2 sided JPAs would be allowed for final bill. Ms. Hernandez was of the opinion that poles would be missed if double sided JPAs were allowed, and inquired if it was possible to mandate or dictate to another member that this was not allowed. The consensus was that final bill JPAs should be one sided. The members also agreed to add this topic to Unknown Items agenda at the Administrative Board Meeting.

Mr. Chow inquired about the transfer to TWC or TWS(N) and if and when the database/accounts would reflect the changes. Ms Pranata notified the members that the database would be updated by 9/19 and that she would send emails to notify members of the completion.

Ms. Chirrick inquired about the validity of item 9C in the 2011-12 authorized costs, she noted after checking the JPA Alerts she discovered in 2008 there was an Alert removing 9C but there was no Alert reinstating it. Mr. Chow stated that there is only 1 authorized cost, the (a) (b) (c) are just the reasons.

Review of Action items/JPA Alerts.

- Form 11 for discussion in October
- Ms. Pranata to email Members new TWS(N) account numbers

Then Meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m. until October 10, 2012.

Ryan Jones, Committee Staff

JOINT ATTACHMENT NOTIFICATION OF G.O. 95 NON-CONFORMANCE

The following condition type(s) has been identified during the normal course of business. Your company or company's tenant may have created a safety and / or reliability condition that could adversely affect power and communication systems. Provided is this notification so your company can take the appropriate action.

Date: _____

To: _____ From: _____

Pole No: _____

Location: _____

CONDITION TYPE (*Check all that apply*) Pole Anchor Attachment Other

A. NON-CONFORMANCE

Contact Name _____ Phone No. _____

Email _____

B. RESPONSE

Contact Name _____ Phone No. _____

Email _____

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE
279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone (909) 599-3801

October 10, 2012

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

Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Shawn Henderson – T-Mobile USA
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. James Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network
Ms. Debbie Wooten – NextG Network
Ms. Amy Parker – NextG Networks
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless (teleconference)
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California
Ms. Tracey Province – Verizon California
Mr. John Bacon – (teleconference)
Ms. Annetta Baker – City of Colton (teleconference)
Ms. Jennifer Navarro – (teleconference)
Ms. Maryam Farajzadeh – City of Vernon (teleconference)
Ms. Joann Miracle City of Los Angeles – DWP – (teleconference)
Mr. Emir Erba – Time Warner Cable
Ms. Angela Pranata – SCJPC Staff
Mr. Kyle Levy – SCJPC Staff
Mr. Ryan Jones – SCJPC Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened by inquiring if there were any questions or concerns regarding the previous meeting minutes. Ms. Chirrick stated page 2 had a mistyped word and requested that it be corrected to signed.

The second item on the agenda was **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. Ms. Hernandez stated that this was a standing agenda item and was to be discussed at every meeting. Ms. Hernandez presented a JPA where a pole needed to be topped that was under the minimum height requirement of 60'. Ms. Hernandez stated that the Routine Handbook had nothing about topping a pole less than 60' and that section 5.2 would not apply. The members agreed that section 5.2 in the Routine Handbook verbiage be changed to include all poles effective 1/1/2013. (See attached). The consensus was to add section 5.2 to the Discussion Calendar of the Administrative Board Agenda.

The third issue on the agenda was **Item 1552: Cut and Kick Routine Handbook Revisions**. Ms. Hernandez stated that she was unable to complete the updated of section 7.4 and requested that this topic be tabled until the next Routine Revision meeting.

Lastly, the members discussed **miscellaneous items**.

Ms. Hernandez inquired if an unauthorized member on a pole was to receive the PTD costs for a section 7.7. It was the understanding of the SCJPC staff that if a member completed work that member would be able to charge for said work. The consensus was that per the Routine Handbook the unauthorized member would not be able to charge PTD as part of the penalty for being unauthorized. Mr. Levy stated that the SCJPC staff would be notified of the billing error and issue a correction of record.

Ms. Haney inquired about poles being replaced with other than wood. Ms Haney asked if members could include the reason for the other than wood pole on the JPA. She further explained that with the extra cost it would be beneficial for record keeping and communication. Ms. Hernandez stated that this issue was presented in prior meetings and members agreed to include an explanation on the JPA. Ms. Haney requested that Mr. Levy create a JPA alert reminding members to include this information on JPAs. The Members agreed that section 3.14 & 7.14 verbiage be updated to include an explanation of reason for other than wood poles (effective 11/1/2012). The consensus was that this be added to the Discussions Calendar of the Administrative Board Agenda.

Ms. Pearson inquired about the contact mailing addresses located at the committee's website validity, stating Edison had a discrepancy while mailing to ATC. Ms. Pearson stated that the entity that initiated the JPA wanted the copies sent directly to them and not the ATC person of contact at CES. She continued, stating that there were notes stating to send the copies directly to the initiating entity. Ms. Hernandez stated in the past she had a situation where she initiated a JPA for a member; once she was ready to final bill the JPA she didn't have a signed copy because it was sent directly to that Member. Ms. Hernandez stated that in 2009 it was agreed to upgrade the Form 49 to include a return address to inform receiving member where to send the JPA. Mr. Chow stated that it would become troublesome if copies needed to be sent to multiple addresses. He also stated that when an entity is applying for membership to this organization and they agree to all the standards and practices, the mailing procedures are also included and to be followed with the agreement of membership. Mr. Chow stated that with the 45 day period being so crucial the representative listed on the website should be viewed as a failsafe to know that the JPA was sent to the right location. It was agreed to add this topic to the Known Items of the Administrative Board agenda, to notify contractors that JPAs will be returned to the representatives on the website.

Review of Action items/JPA Alerts.

- Ms. Hernandez to provide verbiage for 7.4 Cut and Kick
- Add 5.2a to Discussions agenda
- Add other than wood poles sections to Discussions agenda.

Routine Revision - October 2012

Then Meeting adjourned at 9:45 a.m. until November 13, 2012.

Ryan Jones, Committee Staff

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE
279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone (909) 599-3801

November 13, 2012

A meeting of the Routine Revision Committee took place on the above date, at 12:30 p.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Shawn Henderson– T-Mobile USA
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. James Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Steve Brown – City of Los Angeles – DWP
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Tracey Province – Verizon California
Ms. Jennifer Navarro Yhap – Metro PCS (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – SCJPC Staff
Mr. Kyle Levy – SCJPC Staff
Mr. Ryan Jones – SCJPC Staff

Ms. Hernandez opened by inquiring if there were any questions or concerns regarding the previous meeting minutes. There were no questions or concerns at the time.

The second item on the agenda was **Interpretation of Routine Handbook**. Ms. Hernandez stated that this was a standing agenda item and was to be discussed at every meeting. There were no questions of concerns, and it was agreed to table this topic until the next Routine Revisions meeting.

The third issue on the agenda was **Item 1552: Cut and Kick Routine Handbook Revisions**. Ms. Hernandez presented the members with a revised definition of 7.4 “Cut and Kick.”(See attached). Ms. Pranata inquired about the phrase “close proximity” in the glossary definition asking if close proximity was 1’ or 2’. She further inquired if the SCJPC staff would be required to verify the locations. Ms. Hernandez stated that the SCJPC staff should not have to check anything that by the time the final JPA is received by the SCJPC staff it should be billed as-is. Mr. Chow presented a situation where a JPA has been approved and built the way the JPA was approved, but started receiving Form7 because the other utilities needed to splice, rearrange etc. It was the consensus of the Members that if a JPA is approved and the work was completed as approved, the receiving Member can not contest the JPA. Ms. Hernandez requested that a JPA alert be created. Ms. Hernandez requested that this.

The fourth issue on the agenda was **Item 1556: Form 11**. Ms. Hernandez stated that the Administrative Board agreed to use the form but the item was returned to the Routine Revision Committee because of multiple ownership pole scenarios. It was agreed to add more To” lines. Ms. Hernandez also stated that it should be added to the section 18 samples. The Members agreed that this topic be table until the next Routine Revision meeting.

The fifth item on the agenda was **Item 1561: Section 13-Approval Field**. Ms. Hernandez opened the discussion by stating when a Correction of Record JPA is created, the header of the JPA is shown as the original JPA. Questions have come up as to why there is no approval for the correction of records. Mr. Chow stated that if the Correction of Records needed a refund or change of anything that was not record only, should need a signature. Ms. Pranata suggested that the original information be put in parenthesis and the new information above it. It was agreed to update the Correction of Record example in section 18 and add to agenda for Administrative Board meeting.

The sixth item on the agenda was Item 1562: Review Section 5.4 and 7.7 – Costs of PTD. Ms. Hernandez reopened discussion by presenting a situation where an unauthorized member is on a pole that is being replaced, the unauthorized member should pay for the PTD. She then presented a situation where a joint owner performing the PTD with an unauthorized member on the pole. It was agreed that the unauthorized member should pay the full cost of the PTD. Ms. Pranata stated that the verbiage for section 7.7 and section 5.4 would need to be changed. It was agreed to add verbiage indicating if the unauthorized member was performing PTD they would not receive reimbursement for PTD costs. It was agreed to update the verbiage and add this to the agenda for the Administrative Board meeting.

Lastly, the members discussed **miscellaneous items**.

Ms. Hernandez reopened discussion on section 3.14 and 7.14 by stating they were not approved in the Administrative Board meeting and they have returned to Routine Revision for further discussion. She reminded Members that this was the subject of giving and explanations on JPAs when other than wood poles are used. The Members agreed that this topic be tabled until the next Routine Revision meeting to further discuss within each organization.

Ms. Prescott presented an issue of Caltrans wanting proof of ownership for poles involved with the I405 freeway widening. Ms. Prescott stated that Caltrans is withholding reimbursement payments because they were unable to verify pole records. She further stated that pole records were not acceptable as a form of verification. Ms. Prescott further stated that Caltrans is looking for an official document to validate ownership. Mr. Chow stated that the problem was the suffix letter at the end of the pole numbers, if it shows ”E” at the end of the pole number Caltrans wants verification from Edison indication which Members are on the poles in question. Ms. Prescott suggested inviting a representative to an Administrative Board or Routine Revision meetings to further explain what the Committee is and what is done within the committee. It was agreed that Ms. Prescott would begin to create a template letter to Caltrans and added this topic to the Discussions agenda for the Administrative Board meeting.

Review of Action items/JPA Alerts.

Routine Revision - October 2012

- Create JPA alert for section 7.4 & 13.3 to bill “as-is”
- Correction of Record signature example
- Ms. Hernandez to add “To” Form 11
- Ms. Prescott to create a formal letter to Caltrans
- Update the verbiage for section 7.7 and 5.4.
- Verbiage created for 7.4

Then Meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m. until January 15, 2013.

Ryan Jones, Committee Staff