

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE**  
**279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104**  
**San Dimas, CA 91773**  
**Phone (909) 599-3801**  
**Fax (909) 599-3825**

**May 8, 2014**  
(Revised 05/30/2014)

A meeting of the **GO Rule 18 Notification Workshop** took place on the above date, at 9:15 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Jeff Klarich – Southern California Edison  
Mr. James Eastwood – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Jenny Silva – Committee Staff

**Those attending via teleconference were:**

Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – Teleport Communications America, LLC  
Ms. Maria Ortiz – XO Communications  
Mr. Steve Brown – City of Los Angeles - DWP  
Mr. Jeff Williams – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Mr. David Siewart – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California  
Ms. Josh Mathisen – AT&T California

The meeting commenced at 9:15 a.m.

Mr. Eastwood began the meeting with the review of notes dated 3/2/2010, 3/18/2010 and the final meeting dated 4/16/2010. The topic in these meeting were: Identifying “Safety Hazards” subject to notification requirements set forth in GO 95 rule 18-B. Mr. Eastwood then turned the meeting over to Mr. Klarich. Mr. Klarich is a project manager for SCE; he works in the DIMP department (Distribution, Inspection & Maintenance Program) and has been assigned the task of getting Edison’s third party notifications under control. The goal is to review the list of requirements that were finalized on 4/16/2010 and update it.

The goal is to establish the minimum required information needed for a third party notification. Edison is currently including a minimum of 4 pictures with their notifications and would like to make this a minimum requirement for all other utilities. Mr. Eastwood then asked the committee if they would be open to having Spida come to our next Ad Hoc meeting for a presentation on Spida Min and everything it has to offer as far as third party notifications go. Mr. Eastwood then asked Mr. Brown if LADWP has purchased Spida-Min. Mr.

Brown explained LADWP was in the process of purchasing Spida-Calc. The purpose behind the purchase is to have the ability to adjust load calculations submitted by other companies using Spida. Mr. Brown asked if this presentation would cover the interaction between Spida-Min and NJUNS. Mr. Eastwood was not sure, but feels it would be beneficial to have someone come out and walk the committee through the program. Ms. Hernandez suggested Spida come to the Administrative Board Meeting on May 21<sup>st</sup> 2014. There are always more members present at the Admin meetings. Mr. Eastwood agreed to have someone come out or call in at 10:00 a.m. on the 21<sup>st</sup>.

The committee then reviewed the notes from the previous meetings. Mr. Brown then read out of GO 95, the definition of “Safety Hazard”- A condition that poses a signification threat to human life or property. The committee went on to review the “categories” of safety hazards listed in the notes from April 16, 2010. Mr. Mathisen suggested each utility review these items internally and report back with their notes at the next ad hoc compliance meeting. The committee agreed this would be best. Mr. Eastwood informed the committee this is something Edison has already done internally and agreed to send them their existing list for reference. Mr. Mathisen then asked the committee members if they felt it would be a good idea to come up with a list of items they are currently receiving third party notifications for that do not fall under rule 18, ex: guy guards etc. After some discussion the committee agreed each utility should come up with a list of items that fall under the “what you find you fix” description. Mr. Klarich then suggested an item number from compliance be assigned to this topic. Mr. Klarich informed the members he would be sure to send out all copies of notes from 2010 as well as the final notes from April 2010.

Mr. Mathisen asked if once a notification was sent out, do the recipients have to respond? LADWP informed the committee, for audit purposes there has to be proof that the notification was sent and the receiving company, if responsible, has created a work order to have it repaired. Mr. Siewart then asked the committee what the current process was for figuring out which utility deals with vegetation. LADWP is currently receiving third party notifications for vegetation that is not at the electrical level. The committee feels it should fall on the finding utility to clear the vegetation and bill the other joint owners through the JPA process. Ms. Hernandez pointed out that the current section for billing vegetation only covers placement of new poles and replacement of old poles. The committee agreed this should be discussed at the next Authorized Cost meeting.

**Review of Action Items:**

1. Committee members to review 2010 correspondence.
2. Develop a list of what to send and what not to send in line with GO Rule 18-B. What do we consider a significant threat?

3. Establish a list of “you find it you fix it” items.
4. Establish a list of minimum required information needed on a notification.
5. Come up with a procedure outside of rule 18 for notification of issues that are not considered a significant threat, but still need to be addressed.
6. Follow up on notification for vegetation.
7. Mr. Eastwood and Mr. Klarich to arrange presentation for Spida Min at the next Admin Board Meeting on May 21<sup>st</sup> 2014.
8. List of action items will be reviewed at the May 20<sup>th</sup> 2014 Ad Hoc Meeting.

Meeting Adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

Jenny Silva – Committee Staff