

Oregon Joint Use Association Standards Committee

Meeting Minutes
October 14, 2008

The meeting was called to order at 10:15 a.m. A quorum was present:

Members Present

Gary Lee (Chair), Charter Communications
Scott Jennings, Verizon
Tamara Johnson, Springfield Utility Board
John Wallace, PUC Staff
Scott Wheeler, Comcast
Bill Woods, PacifiCorp

OJUA Staff

Genoa Ingram

Members Not Present

David Asgharian, PacifiCorp
Dave Chaney, Accent Inc.
Jim Corwin, Verizon
Stan Cowles, Qwest
Jim Flu, PacifiCorp
Rob Kolosvary, PGE
Jeff Liberty, Bend Broadband
Mary Mason, Central Lincoln PUD
Gary Payne, Qwest
Gary Putnam, PUC Staff

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the September 17, 2008 meeting were approved as presented.

PDA Software Evaluation

Chair Lee directed asked that the following vendors be listed online with the PDA software evaluation form (See September 17 Minutes, EXHIBIT A) on the OJUA website.

OSMOSE	Pole Maintenance
Accent	Alsea
UAM	Union Data Services
Davey's Tree Service	Alden
K&B	UCI

Staff was asked to include a short explanation for how the form is to be used such as:

“The PDA Evaluation Form was developed by the OJUA Standards Committee as a tool to assist companies in evaluating vendors who offer software services. A list of vendors that offer services to support these endeavors is also included.”

Staff was also asked to send an email to the vendors advising them that they had been listed on the web site.

Scott Wheeler reported that it had been Comcast's experience that if there was a contractor who had developed a system to collect data, there were often proprietary issues over which companies had no control. He suggested that companies develop their own software and instruct contractors to use it, rather than developing their own.

Bill Woods expressed confidence that Stuart Kelly would be willing to share PacifiCorp's product (Gismo) with the industry, if it would be useful.

Mapping Update

Chair Lee reported that Dave Chaney would like to start over and get the base information so it is reliable. He noted that the information has been passed along to the extent that the data may no longer be good. He noted that Rob Kolosvary was collaborating with Dave on the project and expressed appreciation to both for their willingness to assist.

Staff was asked to check with Dave and Rob in two weeks and ask how the project is coming. Staff was also asked if the counter was placed on the mapping page. Staff confirmed that it had been.

Pole Identification Matrix

Staff was given approval to post the Matrix on the web site, leaving the columns blank for those companies that had not responded with an indication of "*No response received to date*".

John Wallace offered that Tim Hunt might know a good contact for Union Data Service.

Bill Woods reported that Alden is bar coding poles. Scott Wheeler commented that it would be interesting to know how far from the pole it would read and what sort of information was included in the code. Gary Lee indicated that it was his understanding that the bar code directed the user to a web page. Staff was asked to print the pole tagging matrix for the Annual Meeting and ask Dave Chaney about doing another demo.

Loose Wires

Chair Lee stated that he would like to see Grandfathering, as outlined in the previously discussed PGE document, play a bigger part in any standard. For example, if equipment was installed before 1997, it should meet code. John Wallace commented that the fear of sanctions played a big part in how loose wires are treated. Chair Lee agreed but noted that companies cannot establish perfection moving backwards; there should be a recommended standard moving forward and then grandfathering of previous builds. Chair Lee will merge the PGE information with the PUC recommendation for next meeting.

Error Rate

Chair Lee noted that the main concern for of most companies was truck rolls and that was the motivation behind defining a best practices standard. He reviewed the Example of

Errors (EXHIBIT A) and discussed the examples with the Committee. Chair Lee will modify the examples to reflect Committee discussion (i.e. “No ‘stated’ violation exists, “exception not applied”, etc.)

Chair Lee reviewed with the Committee the revised Error Rate document (EXHIBIT B) and stated that elimination of truck rolls when it was not necessary was an important goal. However, in order to accomplish that goal, it’s important to reach agreement on what an error is.

The Committee discussed the document and length and agreed that the first four issues were straightforward but that “other discussion points” items required additional information and explanation.

For example, “stated violation does not exist where recent repair not evident”. Committee members discussed modification but agreed that they did not wish to be the QC of errors. Tamara added that there should be a blanket statement indicating an understanding that situations in the field change between inspections; there needs to be a margin for error. Chair Lee posed the question of what that acceptable error rate should be.

John Wallace pointed out that people will never get to a point of agreement as to what an acceptable error rate should be. Tamara suggested that the Committee could recommend a “best practices”.

Committee members discussed the fact that “errors” might be too inflammatory and suggesting replacing it with “unnecessary truck rolls”, “accuracy ratio” or “discrepancy ratio”.

Tamara commented that a lot depends on the expectations of the parties involved and that there should be an agreement between the parties on these points. Scott Wheeler expressed agreement, adding that it is best if parties communicate and come to an agreement.

Bill Woods suggested that there be a third category for “grandfathered”. Tamara noted that parties should have a previous agreement they can refer to. She offered, as a statistics project, to work on a proposal for an acceptable “discrepancy rate”. She questioned how much feedback the citing companies are getting on the inspection data.

Bill Woods commented that he would want to look at the discrepancy rate within a broader sampling. He added that PacifiCorp will start getting feedback on its data soon but it is currently too early to provide feedback. John Wallace praised PacifiCorp for its audit process. He asked if there was any other recourse other than through the administrative rules for dealing with error rates. He also questioned if contracts provide for a civil recourse. Chair Lee responded that a breach of contract does not address time wasted.

All agreed that if a company intends to seek sanctions, then there are requirements that must be met and clearly spelled out.

Tamara suggested that, in lieu of addressing the issues by contract, a company could write a letter indicating, for example, that a company would allow for 100 truck rolls; anything beyond that would be charged back. She asserted that it did not necessarily need to be addressed either in rule or contract. Further, such a letter may trigger additional discussion.

Chair Lee noted that the committee had not yet discussed comm to comm agreements (i.e. facilities do not have to be 12 inches apart.) He questioned if the pole owner cites, is that an error. Bill Woods noted that if, for example Charter had such an agreement with Qwest, there was the assumption that PacifiCorp be copied. Tamara agreed that pole owners would want to be copied on such communications, but noted that the communications must be between those with the authority to make that decision.

Finally, Committee members discussed the fact that maps should be provided and should contain complete information.

Chair Lee will update the Exhibit to reflect the conversation and bring the revised document to the next meeting.

Other Business

John Wallace referenced Michelle's drawing and noted that on the inset depicted a three spook rack. He noted that those racks should be measured from the bottom and not everyone was doing that.

Committee members noted the aerial cable marker exhibits (EXHIBIT C) included with the meeting materials. Chair Lee indicated that they would be discussed at the next meeting.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the OJUA Standards Committee was scheduled for Tuesday, November 18, 10:00 a.m. at the OJUA Conference Room. Chair Lee asked that Grandfathering and Facility Markers be added to the agenda.

Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:01 p.m.