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## THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO AT\&T OHIO'S MOTION FOR EMERGENCY RELIEF

Respondent The Dayton Power and Light Company ("DP\&L") opposes the Motion for Emergency Relief ("Motion") filed by AT\&T Ohio on or about December 28, 2006. As a threshold matter, this Commission should not consider AT\&T Ohio's Motion until it has first resolved DP\&L's Motion to Dismiss for lack of jurisdiction, filed concurrently herewith, which explains that this is a matter for the courts, not the Commission. ${ }^{1}$ As for the merits of AT\&T Ohio's Motion, AT\&T Ohio has fabricated a claim for emergency injunctive relief where none exists. AT\&T Ohio, whose parent company has agreed to pay $\$ 85$ billion to buy another telephone company, makes the incredible claim that it will be irreparably harmed if it is required to fulfill its contractual obligation to pay DP\&L \$45 per Joint Use Pole. Any so-called "emergency" in this matter is financial only; it has been caused solely by AT\&T Ohio's refusal to pay a Deficiency Payment due under its Agreement with DP\&L.

## I. INTRODUCTION

This is a contract dispute between two public utilities. In 1930, DP\&L entered into a Joint Pole Line Agreement Pole Rental Contract ("1930 Agreement") with AT\&T Ohio, under which DP\&L and AT\&T Ohio agreed to share the use of their respective utility poles in overlapping service territories ("Joint Use Poles"), thereby minimizing the costs and operational burdens of building completely independent utility pole systems. On September 30, 1942, the 1930 Agreement was amended by a Supplemental Agreement between the parties ("1942

[^0]Supplemental Agreement"). The 1930 Agreement, as amended by the 1942 Supplemental Agreement, is referred to herein as the "Joint Pole Line Agreement" or "Agreement." In December 1952, the parties entered into an Operating Routine ("Operating Routine") which provided instructions for administering the Joint Pole Line Agreement and is itself a binding contract that, by its terms, is to be given full force and effect unless an unresolved conflict exists with the Joint Pole Line Agreement. Based on information and belief, accurate copies of the 1930 Agreement, 1942 Supplemental Agreement and Operating Routine are attached hereto at Exhibits A, B and C, respectively.

First and foremost, the Joint Pole Line Agreement is a construction and maintenance agreement that was established by two utilities in order to develop and maintain the infrastructure of Joint Use Poles that can be used by both utilities to extend and provide service in overlapping service territories. It is not merely an agreement for one utility to rent space on its poles to another utility.

To create a fair sharing arrangement, the Joint Pole Line Agreement and Operating Routine require that DP\&L and AT\&T Ohio each install and maintain an approximately equal number of the Joint Use Poles. ${ }^{2}$ To the extent that one utility owns more than $50 \%$ of the Joint Use Poles, contract mechanisms exist to bring the ownership interests back to parity. While the imbalance exists, the party that owns the fewer Joint Use Poles is to pay a joint use rental fee

[^1]("Deficiency Payment"), which the Operating Routine explains is "For Deficiency in Joint Pole Units." ${ }^{3}$

The Deficiency Payment is applied in order to make whole the party with more poles for the additional costs of installing and maintaining the excess poles. The Agreement established an initial Deficiency Payment per pole and permits the parties to propose a new Deficiency Payment per pole every five years. If the parties are unable to agree upon an adjusted Deficiency Payment, the Agreement provides for a default Deficiency Payment equal to one-half of the annual pole costs attributable to the difference in the number of poles owned by each party. ${ }^{4}$ The Joint Pole Line Agreement also established certain mechanisms that the party with the lower number of poles can use to restore parity. ${ }^{5}$ These provisions were designed to ensure that each party to the Joint Pole Line Agreement ultimately would carry $50 \%$ of the burden of installing and maintaining the Joint Use Poles, despite the actual number owned by each.

Over the years, AT\&T Ohio has failed to install and maintain the same number of Joint Use Poles as DP\&L. DP\&L currently owns approximately 38,700 Joint Use Poles, and AT\&T Ohio owns only approximately 23,500 . From 1930-1995, the party owning the greater number
${ }^{3}$ Operating Routine, Exhibit C , at $\S 11.101$.
${ }^{4}$ The default Deficiency Payment specified in Article XIII of the Joint Pole Line Agreement is equal to "one-half of the then average total annual cost per pole of providing and maintaining the standard joint poles covered by this agreement." Joint Pole Line Agreement, Exhibit A, at Article XI. That Deficiency Payment per pole is applied to the difference between the number of poles owned by each party, so that the party owning the greater number of poles will continue to incur no more than one-half of the Joint Use Pole cost burden. See Operating Routine, Exhibit C, at 11.202 , interpreting Article XI of the Joint Pole Line Agreement.
${ }^{5}$ Article VIII(d) specifies that if the ownership of new poles cannot be agreed upon, "the party then owning the smaller number of joint poles under this agreement shall erect the new joint poles and be the owner thereof." Joint Pole Line Agreement, Exhibit A, at Article VIII(d). Section 10.101 of the Operating Routine specifies three methods by which the parties can keep the number of Joint Use Poles within "reasonable balance." The party owning the smaller number of poles can: (i) set new Joint Use Poles; (ii) purchase Joint Use Poles from the other party; or (iii) replace the other party's Joint Use Poles with its own poles when replacement becomes necessary. Operating Routine, Exhibit C, at $\S 10.101$.
of Joint Use Poles charged the other a Deficiency Payment of $\$ 2.00$ per pole. From 1995-2005, the Deficiency Payment was increased to $\$ 3.50$ per pole. The $\$ 3.50$ Deficiency Payment is far below one-half of the actual costs of installing and maintaining a Joint Use Pole annually.

In November 2004, having tolerated the imbalance in pole ownership for many years, as well as AT\&T Ohio's continued exploitation of the below-cost \$3.50 Deficiency Payment, DP\&L proposed an increase in the Deficiency Payment to $\$ 45$. When an agreement to that or any other Deficiency Payment was not reached, the default Deficiency Payment provisions of the Joint Pole Line Agreement were triggered. Under these provisions, the Deficiency Payment is set at "one-half of the then average total cost per pole of providing and maintaining the standard joint poles." ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ In this way, DP\&L sought to restore the $50 / 50$ equilibrium contemplated by the Joint Pole Line Agreement. The default Deficiency Payment amount was calculated at $\$ 45$ per pole.

Rather than engage in any meaningful computation of the default Deficiency Payment calculation specified in the Joint Pole Line Agreement, AT\&T Ohio opted instead to stonewall DP\&L for 22 months in the apparent hope that DP\&L would (1) continue to install and maintain 15,000 more poles than AT\&T Ohio, and (2) continue to allow AT\&T Ohio to pay a Deficiency Payment for the differential in the number of poles that was far below one-half the actual costs of installing and maintaining the poles.

On or about December 22, 2005, DP\&L submitted an invoice to AT\&T Ohio covering the annual Deficiency Payment period from October 1, 2004 - September 30, 2005 ("2005

[^2]Invoice"). The 2005 Invoice was calculated using a blended charge of $\$ 3.50$ for the period
October 1, 2004 to March 17, 2005, and a $\$ 45$ per pole per year default Deficiency Payment that became effective on March 17, 2005. On October 26, 2006, DP\&L submitted an invoice to AT\&T Ohio covering the annual period from October 1, 2005 - September 30, 2006 ("2006 Invoice"), which was calculated using a $\$ 45$ per pole Deficiency Payment.

On October 27, 2006, DP\&L sent a Notice of Default to AT\&T Ohio for its failure to pay the 2005 Invoice. After AT\&T Ohio failed to cure its Default, DP\&L, on December 6, 2006, suspended AT\&T Ohio's right to attach to additional DP\&L poles while permitting AT\&T Ohio to remain on existing Joint Use Poles. ${ }^{7}$ DP\&L made clear in the suspension notice that it would entertain a request from AT\&T Ohio to attach to DP\&L's poles in particular cases involving safety of life, protection of property or other exigencies. DP\&L also offered to engage in binding arbitration to resolve the dispute and stated that it would entertain any meaningful offer by AT\&T Ohio to settle the matter. ${ }^{8}$

[^3]In accordance with Article XIV of the Joint Pole Line Agreement, AT\&T Ohio's suspension applies only until AT\&T Ohio's default "is made good;" that is, until AT\&T Ohio pays the valid invoices submitted by DP\&L. AT\&T Ohio's failure to install $50 \%$ of the Joint Use Poles and its refusal to pay the new, cost-based Deficiency Payment for the differential is the sole cause of its claimed "emergency" affecting the public interest.

## II. AT\&T OHIO HAS NOT SATISFIED THE HIGH STANDARD FOR GRANTING INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

"An injunction is an extraordinary remedy in equity where there is no adequate remedy available at law. It is not available as a right but may be granted by a court if it is necessary to prevent a future wrong that the law cannot." Garono v. State, 37 Ohio St.3d 171, 173, 524
N.E.2d 496, 498 (Ohio 1988) (emphasis added). The right to relief must be clearly
demonstrated. Langley v. Fetterolf, 89 Ohio App. 3d 14, 17, 623 N.E.2d 577, 579 (Ohio Ct.
App. 1993). ${ }^{9}$

AT\&T Ohio is not entitled to the extraordinary remedy of injunctive relief, because it cannot demonstrate the requirements necessary for such relief. It is well accepted that in determining whether to grant injunctive relief courts consider whether:
"(1) the movant has shown a strong or substantial likelihood or probability of success on the merits; (2) the movant has shown irreparable injury; (3) the preliminary injunction could harm third

[^4]parties; and (4) the public interest would be served by issuing the preliminary injunction."

Johnson v. Morris, 108 Ohio App. 3d 343, 352, 670 N.E.2d 1023, 1029 (Ohio Ct. App. 1995).

In addition, under court decisions, AT\&T Ohio must establish its entitlement to injunctive relief by clear and convincing evidence. Westco Group, Inc. v. City Mattress, 1991 Ohio App. LEXIS 3878, at *8 (Ohio Ct. App. 1991). ${ }^{10}$ Proof of entitlement to relief by a preponderance of the evidence is insufficient to receive such injunctive relief. Mead Corp. v. Lane, 54 Ohio App. 3d 59, 63, 560 N.E.2d 1319, 1324 (Ohio Ct. App. 1988). Here, AT\&T Ohio has provided no evidence at all that it is entitled to injunctive relief. ${ }^{11}$ Rather than submit affidavits demonstrating the facts it asserts, AT\&T Ohio relies only on the arguments of counsel which are not competent evidence.

## A. AT\&T Ohio Is Not Likely To Succeed On The Merits Of Its Claim

In order to obtain injunctive relief prohibiting DP\&L from enforcing its suspension of AT\&T Ohio's future joint use rights, AT\&T Ohio first must establish by clear and convincing evidence that it likely will prevail on the merits of his case. Scott v. OHSAA, 2000 Ohio App. LEXIS 3193, at *32 (Ohio Ct. App. 2000). It has not come close to meeting that burden.

## 1. AT\&T Ohio Will Not Prevail Because PUCO Does Not Have Jurisdiction

Since this is a contract dispute between public utilities involving a request for money damages, the action properly rests with the courts and not the Commission. DP\&L already has

[^5]filed a complaint in the Court of Common Pleas for Montgomery County to resolve this matter.
AT\&T Ohio will not succeed on the merits before the PUCO, because the Commission lacks jurisdiction over this matter, as explained in DP\&L's concurrent Motion to Dismiss.

AT\&T's Motion makes plain that the relief it seeks from this Commission is the type of relief that is within the jurisdiction of the Common Pleas Court. Section 2727.03 of the Revised Code ("Courts authorized to grant injunctions") provides statutory authority to courts to issue injunctions and the Common Pleas Courts are vested with jurisdiction to issue them. ${ }^{12}$ AT\&T's Memorandum in Support even reads as if it were filed in a court and seeks injunctive relief of the sort typically considered by courts.

According to AT\&T Ohio, the "purpose" of its emergency relief request is "to preserve the status quo of the parties pending final adjudication of the case on the merits." ${ }^{13}$ That "purpose" is precisely the purpose of a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction from a court. AT\&T Ohio continues by noting what a court would look at "[i]n deciding whether to issue a preliminary injunction," and explains the four-part test that courts will use to

[^6]decide upon injunctions. ${ }^{14}$ But its motion is not brought in a court. AT\&T Ohio then discusses the four-part test used by a court in deciding upon injunctions, as well as the standards for "preliminary injunctive relief." ${ }^{15}$

As if these excerpts were not sufficient to demonstrate the essence of the judicial relief sought by AT\&T Ohio, AT\&T Ohio actually admits that it is seeking a judicial remedy by concluding its Memorandum in Support with the request that "emergency relief should be granted enjoining DP\&L ...."16

## 2. DP\&L's Default Deficiency Payment Calculation Was Performed In Accordance With The Joint Pole Line Agreement And Is Consistent With The Agreement's Requirement That Joint Use Costs Be Distributed Equally

AT\&T Ohio's sole contention appears to be that DP\&L's calculation of the default rental payable specified in the Joint Pole Line Agreement was incorrect. AT\&T Ohio, however, has provided no evidence to support its claim nor has it offered its own cost-based charge.

The Joint Pole Line Agreement sets the default Deficiency Payment at "one-half of the then average total annual cost per pole of providing and maintaining the standard joint poles covered by this agreement. ${ }^{17}$ Neither the Joint Pole Line Agreement nor the Operating Routine further explains the calculation. DP\&L employed the most widely accepted calculation of annual pole costs, which is the calculation employed by the Federal Communications

[^7]Commission (" FCC ") to determine the annual cost of providing and maintaining poles in the 32 states subject to FCC pole attachment jurisdiction. ${ }^{18}$

DP\&L calculated the annual cost of providing and maintaining poles in accordance with the FCC's cost methodology. ${ }^{19}$ Because DP\&L was the party owning the higher number of poles, DP\&L used its own poles to calculate the Deficiency Payment. DP\&L employed FERC Form 1 figures to calculate the Deficiency Payment, which are kept on a system-wide basis. All of these procedures are fully consistent with the FCC's methodology. ${ }^{20}$ DP\&L's calculation produced a rental of $\$ 45$ per pole per year. ${ }^{21}$ DP\&L fully substantiated that amount in November 2004 and provided a copy of that substantiation to AT\&T Ohio, which is attached hereto as Exhibit G.

[^8]AT\&T Ohio claims that the DP\&L's calculation of the default Deficiency Payment "does not pass the straight face test," because the $\$ 45$ default Deficiency Payment is so much higher than the historical $\$ 2.00$ and $\$ 3.50$ Deficiency Payments. ${ }^{22}$ The fact that AT\&T Ohio was the beneficiary of below-cost Deficiency Payments for decades, however, hardly proves that the new Deficiency Payment is not cost-based as required by the contract. AT\&T Ohio may not like the result of the default Deficiency Payment and may not like the Joint Pole Line Agreement's requirement that the parties share joint use costs, but its objections do not make the new Deficiency Payment unfair, inappropriate or inconsistent with the contract.

## 3. DP\&L Fully Substantiated Its Deficiency Payment Calculation While AT\&T Ohio Stonewalled

During the entire 22-month negotiation period from March 2005 to December 2006, AT\&T Ohio offered no alternative calculation under the contractual terms and provided no explanation of why it believed DP\&L's Deficiency Payment calculation was incorrect. In fact, several of the claims raised by AT\&T Ohio in its Complaint were never presented to DP\&L. Absent any competing calculation by AT\&T Ohio, DP\&L's default Deficiency Payment calculation is entitled to substantial deference by the Commission.

## 4. AT\&T Ohio Incorrectly Asserts That It Has Paid the Deficiency Payments That Are Not In Dispute

AT\&T Ohio claims that it has paid the total amounts of the 2005 Invoice and 2006
Invoice that are not in dispute. ${ }^{23}$ That statement is incorrect. The $\$ 3.50$ Deficiency Payment

[^9]amount that AT\&T Ohio has paid is not the undisputed amount; it is the old Deficiency Payment that has been replaced by the default Deficiency Payment.

## B. AT\&T Ohio Will Not Suffer Irreparable Harm If Its Request Is Denied

This is a dispute about money. There is no "emergency." AT\&T Ohio has not and will not suffer any irreparable injury if its request for injunctive relief is denied. Injury is irreparable only if it cannot be adequately measured by payment of damages or otherwise compensated as a matter of law. Hovis v. East Ohio Gas Co., 1980 Ohio App. LEXIS 13103, at *3-4 (Ohio App. Ct. 1980). If AT\&T Ohio possesses an adequate remedy at law, then it is not entitled to injunctive relief. Haig v. Ohio State Bd. of Educ., 62 Ohio St. 3d 507, 510-11, 584 N.E.2d 704, 707-08 (Ohio 1992) (injunctive relief unavailable when adequate remedy at law would have given plaintiff "everything they asked for"). Accord: Zavakos v. Zavakos Enters., Inc., 63 Ohio App. 3d 100, 103, 577 N.E.2d 1170, 1172 (Ohio App. Ct. 1989)(per curiam).

The Joint Pole Line Agreement requires DP\&L to lift its suspension if AT\&T Ohio pays the 2005 Invoice based on the $\$ 45$ default Deficiency Payment. ${ }^{24}$ AT\&T Ohio, therefore, could simply pay the 2005 Invoice under protest - a payment AT\&T Ohio surely can make having recently agreed to pay $\$ 85$ billion for another company. Upon payment, DP\&L would be required to lift its suspension. Should AT\&T Ohio believe that its Deficiency Payment was excessive, it can seek damages for its overpayments from a court of law. If AT\&T Ohio prevails in such an action for contract damages, it will be fully compensated. AT\&T Ohio itself,

[^10]therefore, has complete control over whether DP\&L may impose this suspension, and it has an adequate remedy at law for any damages that it may suffer as a result.

Even as matters now stand, AT\&T Ohio has offered no credible evidence of how the suspension is causing irreparable damage or how it could not be fully compensated by an award of monetary damages. AT\&T Ohio's Motion contends only that it is "costly, inefficient, .... and time-consuming" to set new poles or bury its cables underground, ${ }^{25}$ but it has provided no evidence whatsoever of these alleged costs, inefficiencies and time consuming practices. AT\&T Ohio further offered no evidence to support its contentions that it will be unable to serve its customers in a timely manner, ${ }^{26}$ and that its business relationships will be harmed for that period. To the extent that AT\&T Ohio can identify any customer that it may have lost as a result of DP\&L's suspension, its losses seemingly would be easy to calculate based on lost monthly revenues or some other measure.

Whatever harm may befall AT\&T Ohio if it opts to keep the suspension in place, it certainly does not include any inability to reach its customers. AT\&T Ohio admits that it can erect its own poles and/or place its cables underground. In fact, during 2006, AT\&T Ohio sought to make attachments in Clark County, Ohio to additional poles owned by DP\&L. When DP\&L suggested that AT\&T Ohio purchase the poles so as to reduce, rather than increase, the ownership imbalance, AT\&T Ohio chose to install its lines underground. Furthermore, AT\&T Ohio presumably could make available the wireless telephone service offered by its affiliate Cingular Wireless as required to serve customers temporarily during this dispute. To the extent

[^11]that AT\&T Ohio can demonstrate that any customer is being denied basic telephone service as a result of the suspension, DP\&L will, consistent with provisions in the Operating Routine, permit AT\&T Ohio to buy the Joint Use Poles needed to serve such a customer. In fact, AT\&T Ohio recently approached $D P \& L$ requesting to purchase 11 of DP\&L's poles, and DP\&L agreed to the sale. Any such purchases will ensure that customer needs are met while also providing some slight reduction to the current imbalance in ownership of Joint Use Poles.

There is no reason to suspect that a company the size of AT\&T Ohio, whose parent company intends to purchase BellSouth for $\$ 85$ billion, ${ }^{27}$ cannot find sufficient funds and other resources to serve its customers by going underground, constructing new poles of its own, offering wireless service, or purchasing Joint Use Poles.

## C. DP\&L Will Be Harmed by AT\&T Ohio's Requested Injunction

"When granting an injunction, the trial court must give due consideration to the rights of all parties in interest, not just that party seeking the injunction." Cullen v. Milligan, 79 Ohio App. 3d 138, 141, 606 N.E.2d 1061, 1063 (Ohio App. Ct. 1992). If AT\&T Ohio's requested relief is granted, DP\&L will be harmed, while denial of its requested relief will not harm third parties.

The order that AT\&T Ohio seeks would make the existing 15,000 pole ownership imbalance worse and simply add to the unfair burden already placed on DP\&L to own and maintain more than its fair share of Joint Use Poles. ${ }^{28}$

[^12]
## D. The Public Interest Supports Denial of AT\&T Ohio's Request

The default remedy specified in the Joint Pole Line Agreement was created to address the failure by one party to comply with its requirements under the Agreement and in that respect are no different than similar remedies provided in countless other agreements.

Permitting contracting parties to use default remedies to enforce their agreements benefits the public by preserving the integrity of contracts. In this proceeding, for example, AT\&T Ohio apparently had no intention of negotiating in good faith in accordance with the Joint Use Pole Agreement until DP\&L suspended its rights to future joint use.

For the same reasons that AT\&T Ohio will not be harmed by denying AT\&T Ohio's request for injunctive relief, third parties also will not be harmed. As explained above, AT\&T Ohio very easily can take action leading DP\&L to lift the suspension, simply by paying the $\$ 45$ default Deficiency Payment specified in the Joint Use Pole Agreement and seeking whatever redress in court it believes is appropriate. AT\&T Ohio, therefore, can achieve full access to DP\&L's poles without Commission involvement, and AT\&T Ohio's customers can continue to be served in the usual manner. Additionally, AT\&T Ohio could service its customers by constructing its facilities underground or attaching them to its own poles

AT\&T Ohio has not explained which services it allegedly is prevented from offering during the suspension or which types of customers it allegedly is prevented from serving, but the evidence would not support such a claim. Even if AT\&T Ohio did not have the power to lift the

[^13]suspension itself by paying the disputed Deficiency Payment, third parties still would be able to receive the type of services provided by AT\&T Ohio.

A plethora of other service providers exists to satisfy the communications needs of third parties. Traditional wireline telephone service is available in DP\&L's service territory from numerous competitive local exchange carriers, and similar Voice over Internet Protocol telephone service is offered by Time Warner Cable and Vonage. ${ }^{29}$ Wireline telephone service often can be replaced by wireless telephone service, such as the Cingular service that AT\&T Ohio's parent company will soon control completely following its $\$ 85$ billion takeover of BellSouth. High-speed and dialup Internet services are available from cable television providers and other Internet Service Providers, and video service is available from cable companies and direct broadcast satellite providers like DIRECTV. ${ }^{30}$

## E. AT\&T Ohio's Request Is Barred by Principles of Equity

It is a well-settled principle of law in Ohio that for equity to be granted, the party seeking equity must do so with clean hands. Ohio Vending Machs., Inc. v. $C \& J$ Games \& Music, Inc., 1991 Ohio App. LEXIS 2589, at *14 (Ohio App. Ct. 1991).

As explained above, AT\&T Ohio has repeatedly stonewalled DP\&L and failed to negotiate in good faith a new Deficiency Payment amount. Over the 22 -month course of

[^14]negotiations, AT\&T Ohio: (i) failed to substantiate any objections to DP\&L's default Deficiency Payment calculation; (ii) failed to provide any alternative Deficiency Payment calculation of its own; (iii) offered an unreasonably low Deficiency Payment that was not based on the default calculation specified in the Joint Pole Line Agreement; and (iv) made false claims that DP\&L was charging for too many poles and -- as a last minute diversionary tactic defying 76 years of conduct between the parties -- that AT\&T Ohio should be entitled to revenues collected by DP\&L for third party attachments to DP\&L poles.

Beyond any question, AT\&T Ohio has not lived up to its obligation to install and maintain one-half of the Joint Use Poles, as required by the Joint Pole Line Agreement. In fact, over the last six months prior to suspension, AT\&T Ohio made requests that would worsen the imbalance, by asking that additional existing DP\&L poles that are not Joint Use Poles be designated as Joint Use Poles so that AT\&T could attach to them. When DP\&L proposed that AT\&T Ohio purchase some of these poles to help reduce rather than increase the imbalance, AT\&T Ohio refused to do so.

AT\&T Ohio's own stonewalling and apparent bad faith led DP\&L to impose the suspension that AT\&T Ohio now seeks to undo with its unsupported request for injunctive relief. Under these circumstances alone, AT\&T Ohio's conduct should not be rewarded. AT\&T Ohio's unclean hands preclude the Commission's grant of equitable relief.

## III. CONCLUSION

This is a dispute regarding money damages related to a contract between two public utilities. AT\&T Ohio asks the Commission to grant injunctive relief to correct an "emergency" that AT\&T Ohio itself has created by refusing to pay a Deficiency Payment calculated by DP\&L
in good faith under the existing contract. AT\&T Ohio comes nowhere near satisfying the fourprong test for injunctive relief, even if applicable to Commission action, and its unclean hands bar the utility from seeking such relief in any event. DP\&L therefore respectfully requests that the Commission deny AT\&T Ohio's Motion with prejudice.
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fRESERV, As applled to space on a pole means that such spece Is occupled space provided and maintained by the ovner elther for ths own exclustve use op exprepsItfortho Licensee exelustre use at the LIcensees requesta
ESTANARD JOTNATOLF 1 s 35 foot WOod pole forerear lot construction and a 40 foot wood pole for street construetton.


ARHCLIDI

## TIABHITY CTAUSE

 Whenever eny $11 a b 414$, hereinefter deslghated es tsich Lhabluty", shatll be incurred by on ardso agatnst efther on both and/ondeath of an employee or epployees of otthep party herefot or for ingury to the propenty of elther party hepeto, on for


1 hes ln aceordance whth the provistons hereof to any ho dhte genee on tis part, shall he assumed and borne by it.
(e) AD such 1pbltty to perpens not parttos to tha contradt non employed of elthen party hereto for elther persond, or property damges and/or for, the cecth of a, person not, an ere ployee of el ther party hereto due to negllgence of both pertles hereto or die to ceuses whleh connot bo tracea to the negltgence of elther party hereto, shal be borne by them equally, that ts, onoh shall essume and bear one helf thereof; provided, however, that 1 n any ease under thls paragraph where the ela thent egstes to settle any such olaimupon terms acceptable to one of the pare thes hereto but not to the other, the party to which suen téms are acceptable, may at itselection, pay to the other pantyonehatf of the expense which such settlement would involve, and thereUpon the other party sha 11 be bound to protect the party makith such peyment from ell further liability and expenses on account of such elain.
(a) In the ovent an employeo of tho Electric company should be infurod or killed while in the course of hts eneloyitent uponor In connetton with the poles or any of them jointiy used here-

 Tephone Compary in oonnecton when suah pole or Ines or thele openation ent shoule sue the Lelephone 6 ompary tom dankese bosed upon such dileged negligenco and suah pult should mesult in a judgnent and be pald or satisfled by 10 or such clam should be
 Oompeny olther befere or after auit, then notw thetandtrg spec juege ment or settanent, the questhon of whether such infury wes due to
negligence of the Pelephone Compeny, or the Electrie company, of both, shall within 30 days from pament or satisfaction of the yudge ment or settiement be considered jointly by three persons in the organtzation of eaeh panty tereto to be destgneted by thetrytert peetive officens, If the conclusion fs reached py the dealerioted representatives of the parties hereto that such injury or death was not dae nor proxtmately contrubuted to by negligence of the TeLephone oompany or was due to negligenee of the electre Company or of both companies, or if e mejortty of such representatites should fal1, to agree in regard to the natter, then, 19 the sop, pald by the Helephone Company to satisfy such judgment or in set. tlement, including interest thereon and costs of suyt, shoute be in excess of the sum pald by the Electric Gompany under the Vankenst Compensation Law of ohio because of such castuaty, one-half of such excess shall be paid by the Electrlo company to the Melephone Oompeny At the request of the Telephone Company, the plectric Company sho 11 assist in the defense of any such sult. ( (e) In the ovent an employe of the Telephone Oompery should be infured or killed whlle in the course of his employient upon or in connection with the poles or any of them jointly used herounder or the 11 nes upon any sueh poles, and he or his depende onts should, olarm auch 1 nuny of death was due to negleqenco or the Electrle company in connection whth any such pole or lines on thelr operathon and rhould sue the Electric Company for dameges besed on such alleged negligence and such suit should result in a juagment and be pata or sattsfled by $1 t$ or suoh clatm shoula be setthed hy the Hectrte oompany wath the consent of the pelephone company elther befone or after sutt, then notwithstanding such judgent or settiement, the question of whether such injury was ave to negtlgenee
of the DLetrio company or the Telephone Company or beth, ohet within 30 daya from payment or satisfotson of the fuagont an settoment oo considenea jolnty by three ponsong thethergand zatton of each perty hereto to be cesigheted by theln regoeotre
 presentattres of the panties hemeto that suon indury or aeth Was not due nor proximately eontrlbuted to oy nogigence of the Slectric company, or wo dueto negligence of the Telephone oom-

 sum paid by the Electric compeny to satisfy such fudgant or in settlement including faterest thereon and eosts of sults should be Ln excess of the sum pald by the Telephone ompent miner the Workine ts Compensation Law of onfo because of such cgspaltyonehalf ot suchexcese shal be pata by the Telophone company to the Electrio ompany.

At the request of the Electrid ompany the Tetephone Company shal assist In the defense of any suoh sult.
( (f) The designated representatues proviced for in paragraphs (d) and (e) of this Artiole shal determie whethop or not the empleyeo Bo-ingured was hlmenr negitgent in sueh a manor as to contrlbuto to his Infury or deathe If such an omplogea was negIfgent th suoh a manner aso contibute to his injury or death hts negtgence shat be cemed the neg1pence of the party by which ho was omployed.
(1) (g) Fach party hopeto shap1 pay one hal the oosts ghe oxpenses of each tnvest4gethon vader poragaphe (a) (e) and (e) of this Article.
(a) All sueh llablity to persons not parties te this contrect, nor employees of either party hereto; for personal injuptes or for the death of a porson or persons not employees of elther party dute to the use of pole stops by such e perpon or persons on eny of the poles ontomplated by this agreoment silial be borne by the party for whose use the pole steps were instaled or pormitted on the pole, and ft shall hold the other party free and harmless from any and all damages resultant from suoh lifurs. ( (1) The Electric Company shatl assume and bear all damage to 4 ts own property realiting from the joint use of Poles ant der this contract, and shall male no claim agatnst the Telephone Company therefor, except when due solely to negligenee of the lelephone Compeny.
1 (1) The Telephone Company shall assume and bear dill demage to fts own property resulting from the joint use of polos under this contract, due to any cause whatsoover, and shall malte no clain against the Electric Company therefor, except when due solely to negisence of the Electrie company.
(k) The term Injuriesi in this Article as applied to persons shell include death due to injury as well as injurles not resulting in deathe and the terms "employeer, "emplofeest,
 clude both the singalar and plural.

## ARTICLELII

## TERRITORY GOVERED

I
This agreerent shatheover gh1 extsting ootesofeachof



The olty of Dayton and contlgupa torpteory'
The 6Aty of tuqu and oont guoustenrtory?
The city af Xenta and conthadas territory
The etty of wastroston cont Houne and contheousterpfory
 upon by the parties hereto; all in the state of ohio oxeepting themefrom, hovever, -
(1) poles whieh, 1nthe ownerts judgent are necescary for tes own sole use; and
(2) poles which oary, or are intonded by the owner to cerryetre cuits of such charactep thet In the Ownex $s$ judgnent the opoper penderig of tts servicenowor in the futuremekes Joint are of such poles undesirgble.

## ARTIOLE TV

RIGHP OP, JORNE OSP GRANPB
Fach pants hereto grents to the other the rtght, to use its potes subjeet to the terms and conattions herein stated.

## ARTLCLE

PROGEDURE WHEN OHARACTER OF ORROULTS HS OHAMGEA
When ofther party desires to change the oharocer of
 able noticeto the other partyon suoh contemplated change and th the event the the other party agroes to joint use wth such

1180
axty,
changed circuits, then the joint use of such poles shalt pe cont tinued with such changes in construction as may be required to met the terms of the Administratave order No. 72 of The Puble Utilities comiaston of OHIo on any revidion or modiflcation thereof for the character of oircuits involved. In event, howover, that the other party fails within ten days fron reeoipt of such notice to agee $1 n$ writurg to such change then both parties shal cooperate in accordanee with the following plan.

J (2) The cost of moving such ctreuts to the new tocathon shat? be equitably apportioned betweon the perties hereto. In ovent of disaguement as to what constitutes an equitablo apportionment of such cost, each of the parties hereto shall bear one helf thereof.

Unless otherwise agreed by the partles, ownership of any new Ine constructed under the foregoing provision in a new location shall vest in the party for whose use $t t$ is constructed. The net cost of eatablishing service in the new location shall be exclusive of any increased cost due to the substutution for the existing faciltties of other facilities of a subetantially now on Improved type or of heressed eapachty but sha 1 lnchude the cost of the new pole line, Including pights-of-way, the oost of removing attachments from the old poles and the cost of placing the attachents on the poles in the new locatlon.

## ARIICLE VI

SPHOTPIOATONS
Exoept as othervise providod in Sections (a) end (D) of Article IX, the jomt use of poles covered by this agreement
shali at all times be in eonformity with specifications mutualy egreed upon by the parties hereto; which spectfioations shell, as nearly as practicable, be in eonermity wth, or besed upen, the provirions of Adminsetrative onter No. 72 of the Publfoutte
 of. Said spocificattons are to be appended to and become a pant of this contraet, and may be changed or modfted upon mutual agreement.

## ARTICLIE VII

PLACTMG, TRANSERRTNGOR REARANGING AIPACHMBANS
J (a) Whenever the Licensee desires to plece on any pole of the owner whin the ternitory covered by this agreoment, any attachents requining space thereon not then spectically resorved hereunder for the use of the Licenseo, the Lifeensee shall, before placing its attachments on said pole, give to the owner written notice thereof, spectfying in such notice the location of the pole In question and the mimber and kind of attachments which the Jicense desires to plade there on ond the cheracter of the cincults to be used. Withtn ten (10) days after the recelpt of suoh notiee the owmer shall notify the Licensee in writing, whether or not sela pole $1 s$ of those excepted under the provisions of Arthele ITI, Jpon recelpt by the Licensee of notice from the ownet that sald pole is not of those excepted and after the complethon of any transfereing op rearranging which is then requined in respect to sala pole, it may proceed to place its attachments thereon. No glaranteo ls given by the owner of permission from property owners, muplctpelttes or others for tho use of 1 te pole by the Llcensee, and 1 f objection is made thereto and the Licensee ts anable to satisfactority adjust the matter within a reasonetole tme,
the owner may at any time upon ten (10) days notico. in wating to the Licensee require the Licensee to remove its attachments from the poles invelved, and the Licensee shall, within ten (to) days after pecelptof sald notleen removelts attachentoren such poles at 1 ts sole expense. Should the Licenseo fat to remove its attachments as hereln provided the owner may remove them at the fleenseets experise without any liablity whateven for such removal or the manner of making it, for which expence the Licensee shall petmburse the ownor on demand. (b) Hecept as herein otherwise expressly provided, each party shell, at $1 t \mathrm{~s}$ own expense, place, malntain, rearrange, trensfer and remove its own attachments and shell at all times penform such work promptly and in such a manner as not to interfene wth the service of the other party.

## ARTICLE VIII

EREOTING, REPLACING OR REIOCATTNG POLES
(a) Whenever any jointly used pole, or any pole about to be so used under the provisions of this agreenent, is insufficient in size or strength for the existing attachments and for the proposed imediate additional attachment thereon, the Owrie shalt promptly peplace such pole with a new pole of the necessary size and strength, and neke such other chenges in the existing pole line In which such pole is ineluded as the oondthons may require.
(b) Whenever it is necessary to change the location of a jointly used pole, by reason of any state, munictpal or other govermental pequirements, or the requirement of a property ounere the owner shall, before making suoh change in location, glve notice thereof in witing to the Lieensee, specifying in such nottee
the the of such proposed relocation, and the licensee shallet its own expense, at the time so specified, transfer its attachments to the pole at the new location.
(e), Whenever gther perty hereto is ebout te erectenem pole line within the temrtory ooverec py this agreoment elther as an additional pole line, as an extension of an existing pole Ine, or as the reconstruction of an existing pole line, ond le the poles of such new line so to be erected are not those to be excepted from joint use, such party shall give written notice te that effect tothe other party at least axty ( 60 , cays before ber gining the work of erecting such new poles (shorter notice may be given in cases of emergencyl and shali submit wth such notice its plans showing the poposed loeation and character of the now poles, the character of the circuits to be used, and the amount of space thereon that it requires for itg own use together with standerd space for the use of the ather party. The other party shall, within ten (10) days after the recetpt of such notice, reply in writing to the party erecting the new poles, stating whether such othor perty does, or does not, destre space on the said poles, and if Lt does destre space thereon, whether the plans submitted satisfutorlly provide for the requirements of such other party: and If not, beoh other party shat then specify in writing whet $1 t 6$ requirementsere. If such other party requests space on the new polos, and if the spaceso requested is greator than standard space, sald plans shail be so modiflea as to provae the acattont. at space so requested, and the pole IIne shallthereupon oe ereted In occordance with sald modifed plans.
(a) In any case where the parties hereto shall conchude arrangements for the joint use hereunder of any new polesto be
erecthd, the ownership of such poles she 11 be determined by mex tual agreement, due regand being given to the destrability of Gvolding mixing ownership in any given line, In the ovent of asegreenent as to ownership, the party then ewhio the shanter number of jolnt poles uncer this agreenent shal erect the new Joint poles and be the owaer thereof. (he) The party wheh to own the now poles bhat ottonh $1 f$ possible, rights-of-way which will not permit properts owners to object to the use of the peles by the Licensee. In obtarner rights-of-Way, eबch party Ghall Lnsofar as practuable koe stint. lar 1 ght-ar-way forms.
i
(e) The costs of erecting new joint poles coning under this agreement, efther as pole tines, as extenstongof exteting pole Ines or to replace extsting poles, shall be borne by the parties as follows:

V I. A standard joint pole, or a joint pole shorter than the standard, shall be erected the sole expense of the ownere 12. Apole taller and/or stronger than the standard, the extra helght and/or strength of whel is due wholiy to the ownents requirements, shall be erected at the sole expense of the ownen. T. 3 Inthe oese of apole taller and/or stronger thanthe standard, the extra hetght and/or strength of whteh ls due wholy to the ticensee's requirements, the Ifcensee shell pay to the owner a sum equat to the difference between the cost in place of such pole and the cost in place of astandard joint polet the renaining oot of erocting such pole to be bonne by the ownet. 144

In the case of a pole taller and/or strenger than the standard, the extra helgh and/or strength of whieh 1 a due to the requirements of both parties, the Licensee shall pay to
the owner a sum equal to one-half the alfference between the cost in place of such pole and the cost in place of a standard Joint pole, the remaining cost of erecting such pole to be bome by the Owner.
Sty the che of a pole tatler andorstronger than the standard, where a height and/or strength in adalition to that needed for the purpose of elther or both of the partles hereto is necessary in order to meet the requirements of publie authority or of property owners, one-half of the exeess cost of such pole due to such requirements shall be bomp by the Ifcensee; the remaining cost of such pole to be borne as provided in that one of the proe日ing paragraphs, $1,2,3,4$, within which it would othemise properly fall.
I. (g) In any caso where a pole is erected hereunder to replace another pole solely because such other pole is not tell and/or strong nough to provide adequately for the Licensers requirements, the Licenseo, upon erection of the now pole, shalt pay to the owner, in addition to any anount payable by the Itcensee under paragraphs $3 ; 4$ or 5 of Section ( $\theta$ ) of this Artiele a sum equal to the then net value in place of the pole whion ls replaced.
(h) any peyment made by the ficensee under the foregeing provisions of this Article for poles taller than standard are in lieu of mereased rentals and do not in any way afeoct the ownership of sadd poles.
(1) When roplaeing a jotntiy used pole carrying terminels or sertal cable, underground connections on transformer equipment, the new pole shall be set in the same hole which the replaced pole oceupled, unless in opder to meet special preponderating condtions
it is necessary, or desirable, to set it in a different loeation, agreeable to bath parties hereto.

ARTICLE IX
J (a) The owner shall, at its own expense, mantan 1 ts joint poles an a safe and serviceable condition, and in accorde ance with the Admintstrative order No. 72 of The puble uthaties Commsaton of ohto or ony revision or modification thereof, mad or any onders of similar nature which mey be issued by the sede body or in accordancenth spectications mutualif ageed upon by the partles hereto and in coniormity with the provishons of Article VI of this contract, and shall replace such of said poles as become defective. Except asotherwise provided in section (b) of thls Article, each party shall, atits own expense, at all times maintain all of its attachments in acoordance with said Administrative Order No. 72 , and keep them in a afe ondtion and in thorough repair; provided; however, that neither part ty shall be required to rearrange any coble installed prior to the date of this agreement, and carried on the street olde of any pole, so as to ocoupy the field side thereof. $V$ (b) Ant existing font use construction of the pentles honeto whieh does not contom to the said speelftoathons shal , be brought into confonmuty therewith as followsa
W. Wthti one Jear from the date of this agreenent, ten (10) percent of the polostnvelved In such existing jolnt use constructiong and the attachments on sadd polos, and thereafter ten (10) percent per anum sha 11 be brought into conformity wh thest spectifeations, provided, however, that this provision shall not be so applied as to require any then existing cables carried on
the street side of any auch poles to be rearranged to occupy the field side thereof.
$t$
When such existing joint use construction shall have been brought into corfornty wth satd spectileations, It shan at at thmos thereafter be mantainea as provided in Section (a) of this Article.
f. The sost of bringing such existing jotnt use construction into conformity with said spectfications shall be borne by the parties hereto in the manner provided in Section (b) of Article VII and seotion ( $f$ ) of ARtIele VIII.

## ARTIOLE X

## TERMINATION OF JOINT USE

(a) If the own desines at any time to abandon any joint pole, it shall give the Licensee notice in writing to that effect at least sixty (60) days prior to the date on whioh in Intendeto abandon such pole. If, at the expiration of said period, the Owner shall have no attachments on such pole but the Licensee shal not have removed all of its attachments therefrom, suoh pole shall thereupon become the property of the Licensee, and the Licensee shall seve hampess the former Owner of such pole from sll obllgetion, 1ability, dameges, cost, expenses on chart ges Incurred thereafter, because of, on arising out of, the presence or condition of such pole or of any attachiments thereon the property of the Licenser; and shall pay the ovrer a dun equal to the then value in place of such abandoned pale or poles or such other equitable sum as may be agreed upon between the partes.
(b) The Licensee may at any time abandon the use of a foint pole by removing therefrom all of its attachments and
giving ten (10) days notlee in writing thereof to the owner. The Hicensee shall in such cases pay to the owner the full rental. for seld pole for the then current year.

ARTCGE XI
RENTAES


The Licensee shali pay to the Owner as rental for the use of each and every pole any portion of which is occupted by or reserved for the attachments of the Licensee, Two Dollars; $(\$ 2.00)$ per pole per annum.

No rental shall be pald by the Licensee for the use
le of the owner where such use consists only in attachIng guys thereto, or in ettaching thereto wires or cable of the Licensee for the purpose of providing clearance betweon the pote and such wires or cables, and not for the pupose of gupporting the sald wres or cables.

## ARTICLA XII

## RENTAL PAYMENTS

Payments of all rentals under this agreoment sha 1 be made on the first day of February in each year during the continunce of this agrement the first payment to be made on the flrst day of Rebruary, 1931, for the peryod poginntng whth. the date of this agrement and ending on the first day of october, 1930. The rentals payable for said period shal be besed upon a vitten statement to be submtted by oach party herete to the other on or before the first day of December, 1930 , glving the namber of poles of ach party on which space was occupled by, or reserved for, the attachents of the other party on the first day of october, 1930. Thereafter each party shall submit to the other party
on or before the ftret day of December in each succeeding year, a written statement, as of the first day of October, in esch such fear, givang the namber of the poles of eqch party on Which space wes accupted pre or roserved for the at tachments of the other party, and geh sich statement shall used as the basis of the rental charge for the year for which such statement $1 s$ subitted, as heroinafter provided.

Every such statement, Including the statement flat above provided for, shall be deemed to be correct unlesa written notice of erporselaned to extst thereln ahalt be ghten wthin sixty ( 60 ) days from the receipt of such statement, to the party submitting the statement oy the party to which the statement was sumittea. In case of dispute coneerning the coproctress of any such statement, a joint inspecton of the pole or poles in dispute shall thereupon be made suoh inspection to be begun within ten deys (10) after notice of errors olained to exist therein shell have been given as aforesaid, and to be completed within a reasonoble time thereafter. A written report of such inspection; sfined by the inspectors of beth parties, shall be made, and, upon the approval of such report by the officers of both parties such stetement shals, $L 2$ shownto be Incorrect, be eorrectectocordingly

## ARTECLE XIII

## PERIODICAL READTUSTMENA OF EATTALG

A. At the expiration of five ( 5 ) years frontthe date of this agreement, and at the end of everg five $(5)$ year period therearter, the rental per polo por amum thereapter patable hereunder shall be subject to readjustment at the request of elther party made in writing to the other not later than sixty
(60) days before the end of any such tive (5) year pertod. If within sixty (60) aays after the receiptof such a request by ether party from the other, the partes heretornat. fat, to agrearpa e readiutcment of such rentat, then the reatra pert pole por antum so to be pald shal be en amourt equal to one half of the then average total anual cost per pole of providing and mantaining the standard jetht poles oovered ay thla gigree ment, In case of readustment of rentals as heretn provided,


ARTCGEXIV
DEPAULIS

1. If efther party shal make defatit in any of forot $11 g \mathrm{tlons}$ under this contract and such defanit ontinue tharty (30) days after notice thereof in writing from the other party: e11 rights of the party in default hereunder shell be suspendea, Including its rifht to oceupy jointly usoa poles, untils such defaut has been made good, and in aditt $t$ on and withott defeotIng such suspentons, if the owner ghat fati, toperform itsobIf entions hereunder to properly maintaln and to prompty renew Jolnt poles aftem thints days not 100 from the Licensee, the Ht censee shel 1 have the rhsht to mathtan such poles or to nonevt the same at the expense of the owner and It shell be the daty of the owe to lmediate ly poimburse the tacensee for such oxpense पpon the rendition of bith therefor.

ARDICES XV
BHLES AND RHMENF HOR ORX
Upon the completion work porformed hereunder by efther party, the oxpense of which is to be borne wholiy or in
pant vy the other, the party performing the work shat present to the other party, within ninety (90) days after the complethon of such work an itemized statement showing the entireoost of the labon nie metertal empoyed theorn, suporuston end ala oterheac chatges, und shoh other pert sha 11 , ythhin thtrt (30) dyes after such statement is presented, pay to the party ding the whe suah other partyts proportonot the cost of ? sald work.

## ARPICCIS XVI

PRE-EXISTINA OBLICATLONS
$J \because$ If efther of the partios hereto has, prior to the exoution of this agroment confenced upon others, not partas to this agreement, by contract on otherwieo, rlghts and phtyle leges to use eny pole covered by this agreement, nothing horein contanind shall be onstrued as affecting sald rights and profLegos, andetthor penty heroto shal have tho right, oy ontrat
 privileges, fit being expessly understood, however, thet for the purposes of the agreemat, the attachmonts of any outsece party shall be treated as ptachments belonglng to the prantar. gnd the rights, obltgations, anc 11 blittes heneunder of the grantor, in respect to steh attochments, shall be the same as S1 st were the actual owner thereof, excepttreg howewer, sueh Wtes and attachments as are erected on the pole of extherganty by oreer of mintclpal authority or in omplamee with opdanoreos or Rranehises.

## ARPIOLE XVIT

SERVICE OF NOTICES
Whereever in this agreement notice is provided to be given by et ther party hereto to the other, such notleo shathe
 to the Electre company at its office at 205 Fast plust street, Dayton, ohtor or 1ts princtpal offce in sata etty or to the Telephone company at ite office at Daton, onio, or the cese mey be, to such other address as olther party may fromtume to the (esignate 1 whtitng fer thet purpose.

## ARTICLE XVIII

TERM OF AGRESMENT
This agreement shall continue in full foree and
effect for flve (5) years from date hereof, and thereafter unt1l torninated es follows: ether party may, by giving five (5) yeano prevfous notice in vriting to the other party and by removing whthin five ( 5 ) yoars from date of sotd notioe 1 ts attachents from the poles of the other party, teminate this agreement. Thereupon and after the expiration of said five (s) yearpentod, such other party shat have no further rights hereunder tithrespeet to the poles of the party 80 oancelling thls egreenent, and shal Whthat the reve (5) Jear poriod so provideator Hefove Its attaohenta from the poles of the other party In cese of
 et the expense and risk of the delinquent party and without $1 n-$ ourths any 1 ability, remove the delinquent partys attachents therefrom, and $1 n$ the meantime, and unt 1 such removal, sueh
other party shali contthue and reman liable for all oblfgations hereunder with respet to its attachments remaning on the pelves
of the party so cancelling this agreement, for the rentels therefor, end for damages due to accidents in the samo maner and to the same extent as if this egreenent bed not been terminatede as aforesalal
Y, , Upon the temmation of this agreement, as fereln provided the rental charges for the then curnent year, payable hereunder of etther party to the other and then unsetted, sheth be adjusted to the respective dates of the memovel of the attache ments of oach party faem the poles of the other, as hepetrepore provtded, and the mount, then peythe by each party to the other party shall be pald within three (3) months after the date of the termination of this agreoment and after receipt of proper bifls therefor.

## ARTICLE XIX

## ASS IGNMENT OF RIGHTS

Except es otherwse provided in this agreement, nefther party hereto shollassign or otherviso dispose of this ogreoment. or any of tes rights or interests hereunder, or in eny of the jointly used poles, op the attachments or fights-of-way covered by this agement, to any firm, corporation or indivaual, vithout the wrttton consont of the othor party, provided, Lowever, Chat nothing here in contalnea nhal prevent or limit the aght of elther party to make a general mortgage in the usual form on any on all of tts property, rights, privileges, and franchises, or a lease or transfer of ony of them to another corporatuon orgenized for the purpose of conducting bustness of the same senerat character as that of suen party, on tof ctex 1nto any merger or consolifation; and in case of the forectosure of such moxtgage, or in the case of such lease, transfer, merger
or consolidation, its rights and obligations hereunder she 11 pass to, and be acquired and assumed by the purchaser on foreolosure, the transferee, lessee, assignee, merging or onseltdeting company, as the case may bes and provided, further, that subject to all the terms and conditions of this agroement, elther party may permit any corporation conducting a business of the same general character as that of such party, and owned, operated, leased or controlled by ft, or associated or affillated with $1 t$ In Anterest, op coneoted with it, the use of all or any pert of the space reserved hereunder on any pole covered by this egreem ment for the attachments used by such party, in the conduetingof Its satd business; and for the purpose of this agreement, ate sueh attachments maintained on any such pole oy the permission as aforesald of elther party hereto shall be considered as the attachments of the party granting such permission and the plogts, obligatlons, and liabilities of such party under this agreement, in respect to such attachments, shall be the same as if it wore the actual owner thereof.

## ARTICLE XX

## WAIVER OP TERMIS OR CONDITIONS

The failune of elther party to enforce, insist upon or comply wth any of the tems on condt tions of this agreement shal not constitute a general waiver or rellaquishent of any sueh toms or conditions, but the same shall be and remalnat 11 dimes In full foree end effect.

ARTICHE XXI
EXISTING CONTRAGTS

A11 extsthergenents betwen the parties henete fonthe jomt use of poles upon a rental baste whthin the tere ritory coverod by this agreement are, by mutaal consent, heqeby abrogated and anulled.

IN WITESS WHRREOF; the parties rereto heve caused there presonts to bo oreuted in dupleate, and thefr corporgfe seath to be aftrec thereto by thetr reapectre oficers theter unto duly authorized, on the day enc year first above written.

THE DAYTON PONER AND ITGH COMPANY

Whthess:


Gdidh mi eu poutal
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OOCUMENTRLE
NO. 13,16
THE DAYTON POWER LLIGHT CO.
TICCLEROL ASTO


## 

Wimpids, the Dayton Power and Light Company, an Ohio corporation, of Dayton, Ohio, and The Ohio Bell Felephone Company, an Ohio corporation, of Cleveland, Ohio, under date of March 17, 1930, entered into a "Joint Pole Line Agreement - Pole Rental Contract": and,

WHERBAS, it is the desire and intent of the parties that said agreement be amonded as hereinafter provided.

HOM, THERMEORT:
It is agreed by and between said The Dayton Power amd Light Company
and The Ohio Bell Telephone Company that ARTICLBS XI, XII and XVIII of the agreement of March 17, 1930, be and the same are hereby amended so that as amended they shall read as followas

MARTICLIR II - PRMEALS: The use by one party of the other party's poles is in consideration of the use by euch other party of an equal number of polef of the first-mentioned party. In the evont that as of October 1 in any year either party owns more than one-half of the total number of joint poles, the other party shall pay to it a rental of two dollars ( $\$ 2.00$ ) per joint pols for such excess number of poles.

Hio rental shall be paid by the Licensee for the use of any pole of the owner where anch use consists only in attaching gays thereto, or in attaching thereto wires or cables of the Licensee for the purpose of providing clearance between the pole and sach wires or cables, and not for the prorpose of mupporting the maid wires or cables.

Poles exempted from rental under the previous paragreph shall not be taken into consideration in determining whether or not each party uses an equal number of the other party's poles under the provisions of this Article.
"ABTICLI XII - RTHFIAL PAMMBNTS: Payments of rentals under thi agreement shall be made on the firat day of February in each year during the centinuance of this agreement; the first payment to. be made on the first day of Pebruary, 1931, for the perted begianing with the date of this agreement and onding on the first day of October, 1930. The rentals payable for aed period shall be based upon a writton otatement to be submitted by each parby hereto to the other on or before the first day of December, 1930, giving the number
of poles of each party on which space was ocoupisad by, or reserved for, the attachments of the other party, on the firft day of October, 1930.
"Thereafter each party shall submit to the other party on or before the first day of December in each succeeding yoar, a written statement, as of the first day of October, in each such year, giving the number of the poles of each party on which ipace was occupied by, or reserved for, the attachments of the other party, and each such statement shall be uned as the basin of the rental charge for the year for which such statement is submitted, as hereinafter provided.
"Irery such gtatement, including the statement first above provided for, shall be deemed to be correct unlese written notice of errors claimed to exist therein ahall be giren within sixty (60) days from the receipt of such statament, to the party submitting the statement by the party to waich the statement was submitted. In case of dispute concerning the correctnass of any such statement, a joint inspection of the pole or poles in dispate shall thereupon be made; such inspection to be begun within ten (10) Aays after notice of errors claimed to exist therein shall have been given as aforesaid, and to be completed within a reasonable time thereafter. A written report of such inspeation, signed by the inapectors of both parties, shall be mede and, upon the approval of such report by the officors of both parties such statement shall, if shown to be incorrect, be corrected accordingly.

HARMICLII XVIII - TMRM OT AGRHMOMN: This agreenent ahall continue in full force and effect for five (5) years from date hereof, and thereafter until terminated as follows efther party may, by giving five (5) years previous notice in writing to the other party, and by removing within five (5) years from date of said notice its attackments from the poles of the other party, terminate this egreement. Therexpon and after the expiration of said five (5) year period, such other party shall have no further rights hereunder with respect to the poles of the party so cancelling this agreament, and shall within the five (5) year. period ao provided for remove its attaciments from the poles of the other party. In case of its failure to do so, the Owner of the poles in question may, at the expense and siak of the delinquent party and without incurring any liability, remove the delinquent party's attachments therefrom and in the meantime, and until such removal, such other party aball continue and remain liable for all obligations hereunder with respect to its attachments remaining on the poles of the party so cancelling this agroement, for the rentals therefor, and for damages due to accidents, in the came manner and to the seme extent as if this agreement had not been terminated as aforesala.

Upon the termination of this agreement, as herein provided, the rental charges for the then current year, payable hereunder by either party to the other and then unsettled, shall be adjusted to the respective dates of the removal of the attachments of asch party from the poles of the other, as hereinabova provided, and the amount then payable by either party to the other party shall be paid within three (3) months after. the date of the termination of thin agreement and after receipt of proper bills therefor. "

It is further agreed that the amendments hereby provided shall be effective as of October 1, 1941. Hxcept as amended hereby said agreement of March 17, 1930, be and the same hereby is, in all other respects, ratified. and approved.

In WITITSS WHRRTOI, the parties hereto have caused the ge presents to be executed, in duplicate, and their corporate seals to be affixed thereto by their respective officers thereunto duly authorized on the 30 ot e day of Pefotenher. 1942.

VITNESSTME:
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FORM 253-4-15-51
EXCHANGE
THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY
CONSTRUCTION AND JOINT USE PROPOSAL
DISTRICT


Description of wires, circuits, and other contacts to be placed on the poles:

| ENGGINEER | The Dayton Power and Light Company is hereby authorized to proceed with the work provided for above and to render billing or pay billing in the amounts stipulated. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGGT COMPANY | ENGGINEER | ALIL | WORK COMPLETED |
| BY | THE | BY |  |
| DATE | TITLE | TITLE |  |
| TITLE | DATE | DATE |  |

Form 3759 (1-53)
THE OHIO BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY
JOINT USE AND CONSTRUCTION PROPOSAL
Other Co. Div.

Ohio. Other Co. Div.
n in the sketch attached or on the reverse side of this form.

OTHER CO. REPLY | RENTALS |
| :--- | :--- |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |




|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Other Co. File } \\
& \text { Other Co. Dist. }
\end{aligned}
$$

THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY
RENTAL BILLLING ARRANGEMENT WITH $\qquad$
Recapitulation for the month of $\qquad$ 19 $\qquad$ of The Dayton Power and Light Company poles jointly used by
on a rental basis.

District $\qquad$



Submitted by
Concurred in by
The Dayton Power and Light Compary
Per $\qquad$ Per
Title $\qquad$
Title $\qquad$
Date $\qquad$ Date

## THE OHIO BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY mental buling arrangement with

Recapitulation for the month of $\qquad$ 19__, of The Ohio Bell Telephone Company poles jointly used by


Date

| $\begin{gathered} \text { O. в. т. Co. } \\ \text { File } \\ \text { (0) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Accounting Area $\qquad$ (b) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Completion } \\ \text { Date } \\ \hline \text { (c) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grous } \\ \text { Popy } \\ \text { Adosod } \\ \text { (d) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not Total } \\ \text { (0) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Carwied |  |  |  |  | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | , |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | . |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| total | 31 |  |  |  |  |

Submitted by
Concurred in by
The Ohio Bell Telephone Company

| Per | Per |
| :---: | :---: |
| Titie | Title_ |
| Date | Date |

EXHIBIT \#4
 SUBMITTED:
the dayton power and lught company


| B.F.dL. G.B.T, | D.P.dh. CO= |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Form 3479 (4-52)


```
Telephone Gompany
    (Originator)
```

Prepare 4 copies of proposal on Form 3759. Forward No. 1 2 and 3 copies to Power Company. Retain No. 4

Enter data on No. 4 copy and hold in file until work is completed. When work is completed, enter date on both copies and forward No. 4 copy to Power Company. Retain No. 1

Transcribe date to No. 1 copy. Forward No. 3 copy to Plant Records Engineer. File No, 1 copy in Recap rile.

Follow same procedure when Power Company is Originator
bILLING SCHEDULE FOR JOINTLY USED FULL TREATED POLES
THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY and

Schedule A THE OHIO BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY

Effective January 19, 1953
Use for sacrifice value, excess height and/or strength, sale, etc.


> Approved W. J. McLain $\frac{2-6-53}{\text { Supv. of T. \& D. Section of }}$ Electrical Engineering Department The Dayton Power and Light Company

Approved H. F. Gear $\quad 2-6-53^{\text {F }}$
District Plant Engineer
The Ohio Bell Telephone Co.

BILLING SCHEDURE FOR JOINTLY USED BUTT TREATED CEDAR POLES
THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANI
and
THE OHIO BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY

Effective January 19, 1953
Use for sacrifice value, excess height and/or strength, sale, etc.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } \\ & \text { Set } \end{aligned}$ |  | Class | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 52-53 | 100 | 1 | 48.00 | 59.00 | 70.00 | 85.00 | 102.00 | 121.00 | 146.00 | 174.00 |
| 52-53 | 100 | 2 | 45.00 | 55.00 | 65.00 | 79.00 | 95.00 | 113.00 | 135.00 | 162.00 |
| 52-53 | 100 | 3 | 42.00 | 51.00 | 60.00 | 73.00 | 88.00 | 105.00 | 124.00 | 150.00 |
| 52-53 | 100 | 4 | 39.00 | 47.00 | 55.00 | 67.00 | 81.00 | 97.00 | 113.00 | 138,00 |
| 52-53 | 100 | 5 | 36.00 | 43.00 | 50.00 | 61.00 | 74.00 | 89.00 |  |  |
| 52-53 | 100 | 6 | 33.00 | 39.00 | 45.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 52-53 | 100 | 7 | 30.00 | 35.00 | 40.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1951 | 96 | A11 | 28.80 | 37.44 | 48.00 | 58.56 | 71.04 | 85.44 | 108.48 | 132.48 |
| 1950 | 92 | All | 27.60 | 35.88 | 46.00 | 56.12 | 68.08 | 81.88 | 103.46 | 126.96 |
| 1949 | 88 | A11 | 26.40 | 34.32 | 44.00 | 53.68 | 65.12 | 78.32 | 99.44 | 121. 44 |
| 1948 | 84 | All | 25.20 | 32.76 | 42.00 | 51. 24 | 62.16 | 74.76 | 94.92 | 115.92 |
| 1947 | 80 | A11 | 24.00 | 31.20 | 40.00 | 48.80 | 59.20 | 71. 20 | 90.40 | 110.40 |
| 1946 | 76 | All | 22.80 | 29.64 | 38.00 | 46.36 | 56.24: | 67.64 | 85.88 | 104.88 |
| 1945 | 72 | All | 21.60 | 28.08 | 36.00 | 43.92 | 53.28 | 64.08 | 8 I .36 | 99.36 |
| 1944 | 68 | All | 20.40 | 26.52 | 34.00 | 41.48 | 50.32 | 60.52 | 76.84 | 93.84 |
| 1943 | 64 | All | 19.20 | 24.96 | 32.00 | 39.04 | 47.36 | 56.96 | 72.32 | 88. 32 |
| 1942 | 60 | A11 | 18.00 | 23.40 | 30.00 | 36.60 | 4.40 | 53.40 | 67.80 | 82.80 |
| 1941 | 56 | AII | 16.80 | 21.84 | 28.00 | 34.16 | 41.44 | 49.84 | 63.28 | 77.28 |
| 1940 | 52 | All | 15.60 | 20.28 | 26.00 | 31.72 | 38. 48 | 46.28 | 58.76 | 71.76 |
| 1939 | 48 | All | 14.40 | 18.72 | 24.00 | 29.28 | 35.52 | 42.72 | 54.24 | 66. 24 |
| 1938 | 44 | All | 13.20 | 17.16 | 22.00 | 26.84 | 32.56 | 39.16 | 49.72 | 60.72 |
| 1937 | 40 | All | 12.00 | 15.60 | 20.00 | 24.40 | 29.60 | 35.60 | 45.20 | 55.20 |
| 1936 | 36 | A11 | 10.80 | 14.04 | 18.00 | 21.96 | 26.64 | 32.04 | 40.68 | 49.68 |
| 1935 | 32 | All | 9.60 | 12.48 | 16.00 | 19.52 | 23.68 | 28.48 | 36.16 | 44.16 |
| 1934 | 28 | A11 | 8.40 | 10.92 | 14.00 | 17.08 | 20.72 | 24.92 | 31.64 | 38.64 |
| 1933 | 24 | A.11 | 7.20 | 9.36 | 12.00 | 14.64 | 17.76 | 21.36 | 27.12 | 33.12 |
| 1932 | 20 | All | 6.00 | 7.80 | 10.00 | 12.20 | 14.80 | 17.80 | 22.60 | 27.60 |
| 1931 | 16 | All | 4.80 | 6.24 | 8.00 | 9.76 | 11.84 | 14.24 | 18.08 | 22.08 |
| 1930 | 12 | A11 | 3.60 | 4.68 | 6.00 | 7.32 | 8.88 | 10.68 | 13.56 | 16.56 |
| 1929 | 8 | A11 | 2.40 | 3.12 | 4.00 | 4.88 | 5.92 | 7.12 | 9.04 | 11.04 |
| 1928 | ${ }^{-} 4$ | A11 | 1.20 | 1.56 | 2.00 | 2.144 | 2.96 | 3.56 | 4.52 | 5.52 |

Note: Sacrifice Life Values are determined on the basis of the pole values underscored.

Approved W. J. McLain $\frac{2-6-53}{\text { Supv. of T. \& D. Section of }}$ Electrical Engineering Department The Dayton Power and Light Company

Approved $\frac{\text { H. F. Gear }}{\text { District Plant Engineer }} 2-6-53$
The Ohio Bell Telephone Co.

## SCHEDULE B

AN attachanil to the operating routine bated $6-30-53$ beTween THE DAYTON POUER AND LIGHT COMPANY and THE OHTO BEIE TELEPHONE COMPANY
Çost of miscellaneous repetitive items performed by the Electric Gompany forthe benefit of and at the expense of the Telephone Company.
See Sections 11.30 and 11.40 of the Operating Routine dated ..... 6-30-53 ..... -
A. When the work is performed at the request of and for the sole benefit of the Telephone Company, the full amount of the following charges shall apply.
B. When the work is performed by the Electric Company and is for the mutual benefit of both companies, billing will be on a basis of $50 \%$ or such other percentage as is mutually agreed.

| Item | Description of Work Operation | Flat Billing Charges |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| * 1. 5/8" $\times 66^{\prime \prime}$ double-eyey rod and 811 anchor plate |  |  |  |
|  | Total maximum load 8000\# | \$ | 25.00 |
| * 2. | $3 / 4^{\prime \prime} \times 80^{\prime \prime}$ double-eye rod and $10^{\prime \prime}$ anchor |  |  |
|  | Total maximum load 14,000\# |  | 33.00 |
| * 3. | $1{ }^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{x} 10^{\prime} 0^{\prime \prime}$ double-eye rod and $4^{\prime}$ anchor 10 g |  |  |
|  | Total maximum load 25,000\# ...... |  | 50.00 |
| * 4 | $2-3 / 4^{11} \times 10^{\prime}$ double-eye rod and 61 anchor log Total maximum load $32,000 \#$ |  | 60.00 |
|  | * If an existing anchor is to be removed, then add to the above amount |  | 8.00 |
|  | Ground brace new pole - block at top and bottom |  | 24.00 |
|  | Ground brace existing pole - block at top only. |  | 27.00 |
|  | Move $30^{\prime}$ and shorter pole |  | 25.00 |
| 8. | Move $35^{\prime}$ and taller pole |  | 40.00 |
| (Items 7 and 8 apply only where the existing pole can be physically moved.) |  |  |  |
| 9. | Straighten pole |  | 20.00 |
| 10. | Transfer guy |  | 10.00 |
| 11. | Move ground wire on existing pole |  | 7.00 |
| 12. | Install guy insulator in existing guy .... |  | 17.00 |
| 13. | Connect Telephone Company ground wire to Electric Company neutral |  | 5.00 |
| 14. | T (transfer) or H (relocate) secondary rack |  | 6.00 |
| 15. | T or R secondary crossarim-including pins and insulators . |  | 10.00 |
| 16. | T or $R$ prinary crossarm - 4 ky or 12 kv crossarm and brace only - pins and insulators net included ..................... |  | 13.00 |
| 17. | T or R primary pole top pin -insulator not included |  | 3.00 |
| 18. | T or R secondary conductor - aluminum - per conductor |  | 7.00 |



## Charges

 \$ 5.0020. $T$ or R secondary dead end - all conductor types - per conductor 13.0023. T or R primary conductor insulator and pin - straightline - 12 kv - aluminum - per conductor19.00
21. Same as 23 but other types of conductor13.00
22. Same as 25. but dead ends made on pole in vertical arrangement5.00
. Same as 27 but conductors have to be lengthened
25.00
23. T or R crossarm supporting street lighting circuits only ..... 7.00- insulators and pins not included32. Same as 31 but conductors other than aluminum9.00
$\therefore$ conductor - per conductor ..... 13.00

protactive quipment and mounting - protactive equipment or R single phase transformer installation including protective equipment and mounting - fused cutouts and arrester mounted on crossarms - 15 kva size and smaller
78.00
36. Sane as 34 but 25 kra size and larger112.00
38. Estimated cost will be computed when necessary on itemsnot listed above such as, transformer bank structures,primary or secondary cable risers and other special orunusual installations. The estimated cost will be20\% for engineering and administrative expenses.

Note: Items 1 through 6 have the cost of materials included Items 7 through 38 do not include the cost of materials

## SCHEDULE B

Submitted $\quad 10-15 \quad 1952$

THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

By W. Jo McLain Supervisor of T. and D. Section of Electrical Engineering Department

Approved $\frac{10-15}{\text { THE OHIO BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY }} 1952$
By $\frac{\text { H. F. Gear }}{\text { District Plant Enginear }}$

## SCHEDULE C

## an attachment to the operating routine dated 6-30-53 between THE DAYTON PONER AND LIGHT COMPANY and THE OHIO BELL TELEPYONE COMPANY

Schedule of Flat Rate Prices for Repetitive Work Operations performed by the Telephone Company to be billed to The Dayton Power and Light Gompany on the Monthly Billing Summary.

See Sections 11.30 and 11.40 of the Operating Routine dated 6-30-53 -
A. When the work is performed at the request of and for the sole benefit of the Electric Company, the full amount of the following charges shall apply。
B. When the work is performed by the Telephone Company at the request of the Electric Company and is for the mutual benefit of both companies, billing will be on a basis of $50 \%$ or such other percentage as is mutually agreed.

| Item | Description of Work Operation | Flat Billing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 (a) | Install $5 / 8{ }^{\prime \prime}$ anchor | \$ 25.00 |
| m(b) | Install double-eye anchor ( $3 / 4^{\text {I }} \mathrm{rod}$ ) | 33.00 |
| *(c) | Install double-eye anchor (1/r rod) | 50.00 |
| *(d) | Install double-eye anchor ( $1-1 / 4^{*}$ rod) ........................... * If existing anchor is replaced, add $\$ 8.00$ to these prices | 60,00 |
| (e) | Ground brace - new pole ......................................... | 24.00 |
| (f) | Ground brace - existing pole (top only) ..................... | 27,00 |
| \#(g) | Move 301 and shorter poles ........e........................... | 25.00 |
| \#(h) |  \# Applies only when existing pole can be physically moved | 40.00 |
| (i) | Straighten poles (each) | 20,00 |
| (j) | Transfer anchor guy or pole to pole guy (one end only) .... | 10.00 |
| (k) | Move ground wire on existing pole .o.e.................... | 7.00 |
| (1) | Remove cable terminal | 20.00 |
| (m) | Place 10 pair cable terminal | 30.47 |
| (n) | Place 16 pair cable terminal | 36.06 |
| (b) | Place 26 pair cable terminal | 41.66 |
| (p) | Reconcentrate service wire to new terminal loc | 5.00 |
| (q) | Transfer or move crossarms (each) | 5.00 |
| (r) | Transfer or move cable (all sizea) per attach. | 3.00 |
| (s) | Transfer or move one (1) open wire (all sizes) | . 30 |
| (t) | Transfer or move covered wire | . 40 |
| (v) | Move drop wire attach, on subscriber's house | 5.00 |
| (w) | Transfer or move drive hook Transfer or move terminal (pole distribution | 5.35 |
| (x) | Transfer or move terminal (cross-connecting type) | 25.00 |
| (y) | Transfer U.G. lateral to new pole | timated Gost |

Note: Rearrangements on existing poles which would permit continued joint use of an existing pole are biliable. Refers primarily to paragraphs 1.302 and 2.303 of the Operating Routine.

Submitted $10-15 \quad 1952$
THE OHIO BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY
By $\quad$ H. $F_{0}$ Gear
District Plant Engineer

Approved
10-15
1952
THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY
By .. Wo. J. McLain
Supervisor of T. and D. Section of Electrical Engineering Department

## 1001 GStreet. N.W.

Stuite 500 West
Washington, D.C. 20001
red 202.434.4100
fax 200.434,4646

# Writer's Direct Access <br> Jack Richards (202) 434-4210 richardzexhlew.com 

# Via Electronic and Overnight Delivery 

## Grace Sury

Joint Use Manager - Ohio
AT\&T Midwest
150 E. Gay St., 6 H
Cohumbus, Ohio 43215

> Re: Joint Use Operations
> NOTICE OF SUSPENSION FURTHER NOTICE OF DEFAULT

## Dear Ms. Sury:

Our firm has been retained by The Dayton Power and Light Company ("DP\&L") in connection with AT\&T"s failure to pay DP\&L's invoices for Pole Contact Rentals from October 1, 2004 through September 30, 2005 ("2005 Invoice"), and October 1, 2005 through September 30, 2006 ("2006 Invoice"), in accordance with the terms of the Joint Pole Line Agreement, Pole Rental Contract, between The Dayton Power and Light Company and The Ohio Bell Telephone Company (predecessor-in-interest to AT\&T), dated March 17, 1930 (the "1930 Agreement"), as amended by the September 30, 1942 Supplemental Agreement between the parties ("1942 Supplemental Agreement'), and in conjunction with the interpretative guidance provided by the December 1952 Operating Routine. ${ }^{1}$

We have analyzed AT\&T's correspondence relating to this issue, including the November 21, 2006 letter ("November 21 Letter") from you to Ms. Patricia Swanke, DP\&\&'s Vice President of Transmission and Distribution, ${ }^{2}$ and find no legitimate basis for AT\&T to refuse payment of these invoices. Accordingly, you are hereby notified pursuant to Article XIV of the Agreement that effective immediately AT\&T's rights in the granting of further Joint Use are SUSPENDED until AT\&T corrects its Default by paying the 2005 Invoice. In addition,

[^15]
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please be advised that AT\&T is in FURTHER DEFAULT of the Agreement for its failure to pay the 2006 Invoice in full within 30 days of the October 26, 2006 invoice date. AT\&T's failure to cure its nonpayment of the 2006 Invoice within 30 days of this letter will constitute further grounds to suspend AT\&T's Joint Use rights. ${ }^{3}$ DP\&L reserves the right to impose additional sanctions as provided in the Agreement.

As explained below, AT\&T's claims regarding these invoices are at odds with the plain language of the Agreement and with more than 50 years of dealings between the parties.

## Calculation of Annual Rental

Pursuant to Article XIII of the Agreement, DP\&L proposed to revise the annual rental rate in November 2004. The parties failed to agree on a new rate, triggering the requirement to establish a rate equal to "one-half of the then average total annual cost per pole of providing and maintaining the standard joint poles covered by this agreement."

DP\&L performed the required cost calculation in accordance with the cost methodology specified in Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") regulations, which is the most commonly-accepted methodology for calculating such costs. The FCC's methodology produced a rate of $\$ 45$ per pole, which DP\&L fully substantiated in March 2005.

At no time since that date has AT\&T provided any documentation to refute DP\&L's calculation. The November 21 Letter itself provides no such documentation. The letter's bare conclusion that DP\&L's $\$ 45$ figure is "inconsistent with the method of calculation set forth in the Agreement and is otherwise incorrect" is completely unsubstantiated. AT\&T's inability to address let alone rebut DP\&L's rate calculation highlights the unreasonableness of AT\&T's position.

The number of poles to which this $\$ 45$ annual rate must apply is specified in the Agreement. That number is clarified by the parties' December 1952 Operating Rontine, which has been well established by more than 50 years of standard practice and is consistent with the clear intent of the Agreement itself.

As originally specified in 1930, Article XI of the Agreement required each party to pay an annual pole rental to the other for every one of the other party's poles to which it was attached. That 1930 provision required that each party write a check to the other for all of its
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attachments to the other's poles. Twelve years later this process was changed by the 1942 Supplemental Agreement, which modified Article XI to require only the party owning fewer joint use poles to reimburse the party owning more poles for the difference between the number of poles owned by each party:

> ARTICLE XI - RENTALS: The use by one party of the other party's poles is in consideration of the use by such other party of an equal number of poles of the first-mentioned party. In the event that as of October 1 in any year either party owns more than onehalf of the total number of joint poles, the other party shall pay to it a rental of two dollars $(\$ 2.00)$ per joint pole for such excess number of poles.4

The "excess number of poles" specified above refers to the disparity between the poles owned by each party, not, as you claim, the number of poles exceeding the $50 \%$ benchmark. By requiring payment to the party owning the excess number of poles, Article XI returns the parties to the equivalent of owning an "equal number of poles," which is the equilibrium point envisioned by this section. In this manner, Article XI compensates the parties for each other's pole use in the same manner as the 1930 requirement, except that only one check is exchanged by the party owning fewer poles.

The intent of the Article XI annual rental payment provision is to evenly distribute the costs of joint use as if each party owned an "equal number of poles." Article XI achieves this equitable distribution by requiring each party to pay for one-half of the costs of owning and maintaining the poles, regardless of whether one of the parties owns fewer or more than $50 \%$ of the poles. In that way, the burden of owning and maintaining $50 \%$ of the poles essentially remains the same for both parties despite the number of poles that each party owns. Article XI accomplishes this goal by "splitting" in half the "total annual cost per pole" that is associated with the difference in the number of poles owned by each party.

AT\&T's approach would be to require "spliting" in half the costs associated with only the number of poles needed for the deficient party (AT\&T) to reach the $50 \%$ level. By splitting only this lower, arbitrary number of poles, the party owning the greater number of poles (DP\&L) would be required to pay for $75 \%$ of the costs ássociated with the difference in the namber of poles owned by each party (ie., one-half of the costs associated with the poles needed by AT\&T to reach the $50 \%$ level and $100 \%$ of the costs associated with the poles above the $50 \%$ level needed to reach DP\&L's level). Requiring DP\&L to pay for $75 \%$ of the costs of these poles
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while AT\&T pays only $25 \%$ would be inconsistent with the "equal number of poles" requirement expressed in Article XI. AT\&T's approach would violate the plain language of the Agreement, as well as the longstanding Operating Routine, and is plainly inequitable. It would reward the underperforming party (AT\&T) at the expense of the performing party (DP\&L).

Any uncertainty as to the meaning of this language in the Agreement is resolved unambiguously by the December 1952 Operating Routine, which clarifies that the "excess number of poles" refers to the difference between the number of poles owned by each party:

> On the $1^{11}$ day of October of each year, the difference between the total number of joint poles owned by each company shall be determined from the last entry on the September Monthly Recapitulation of each company in the columns headed "Gross Poles Added." The company owning the lesser number of joint poles shall pay to the company owning the greater number of joint poles an amtount of $\$ 2.00$ per pole for each pole of the above difference. ${ }^{\text {² }}$

DP\&L is unaware of any instance during the entire 64-year history of the 1942 Supplemental Agreement in which AT\&T or any of its predecessors has made a similar claim that pole costs should be "split" only until the deficient party reaches the $50 \%$ level. For 64 years, it appears that the party owning fewer poles paid annual rentals based on the difference. between the number of poles owned by each party, as required by the Agreement and the Operating Routine, and as specified by DP\&L in its invoices.

## Third Party Rentals

For as long as the parties have engaged in joint use, it appears that all attachments by third parties to DP\&L's poles have been administered by DP\&L, and that none was administered by AT\&T. DP\&L, not AT\&T, received and processed applications, performed design and engineering work, performed necessary make ready, changed out poles when appropriate, performed inspections and audits, and otherwise bore the entire expense of administering third party attachments. .

[^18]
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More than 75 years after the establishment of the DP\&L/AT\&T joint use relationship, and despite having incurred none of the cost and expense of administering third party attachments, AT\&T for the first time has asserted that third party revenues from attachments to DP\&L's poles should belong to AT\&T. That claim is preposterous.

The Agreement itself contains no provision authorizing AT\&T to collect revenue from third party attachments or even to license those attachments. The Operating Routine, for its part, states that attachments which are "in the nature of Signal or Communication Circuits" must be "provided and licensed" by AT\&T at AT\&T's own "cost and expense, ${ }^{2 / 5}$ but it does not mention revenues or otherwise authorize AT\&T to collect revenues.

Having failed to take any part in the licensing of third party attachments on DP\&L's poles, it is with apparent bad faith that AT\&T now claims some undefined contract right to receive third party revenues stemming from the attachments. If AT\&T ever had any such right, which DP\&L contests, it was waived long ago by AT\&T's failure to undertake any licensing responsibility or to assert any claim to revenues.

Finally, we emphasize that the poles at issue are owned by DP\&L, not AT\&T. Even absent a waiver, AT\&T's licensing of third party attachments today would violate Ohio Revised Code Section 4905.71 and DP\&LL's pole attachment tariff, both of which require attachments to be licensed by DP\&L. ORC $\$ 4905.71(\mathrm{~A})$ specifies, in relevant part: "Every telephone, telegraph, or electric light company ... shall permit ... the attachment of any wire, cable, facility, or apparatus to its poles," and that "every telephone, telegraph or electric light company shall file tariffs with the public utilities commission containing the charges, terms and conditions established for such use. ${ }^{\boldsymbol{2} \mathbf{1}}$ Any Operating Routine provision to the contrary would violate both the statute and DP\&L's PUCO-approved tariff.

AT\&T's claim that it is entitled to three feet of space on the pole and that DP\&L somehow has been depriving AT\&T of its three feet of space is simply erroneous. To our knowledge, DP\&L never has denied AT\&T the use of its three feet of space required by the Agreement, and AT\&T has suffered no prejudice whatsoever from DP\&L's licensing of third party entities.

[^19]
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DP\&L takes this suspension action reluctantly and with considerable disappointment, but AT\&T's refusal to comply with the Agreement leaves DP\&L with no choice. Over the course of many months, DP\&L has negotiated in good faith in an attempt to resolve differences without taking this step. DP\&L will entertain a request from AT\&T to attach to DP\&L's poles in particular cases involving safety or life, protection of property or other exigencies. Under these limited circumstances, DP\&L will lift the suspension in specific instances to accommodate AT\&T's identified requirements. We emphasize, however, that the suspension will not be lifted across-the-board until AT\&T complies with the requirements of the Agreement and makes payments accordingly. Furthermore, as noted above, DP\&L reserves its right to take additional action consistent with Article XIV should AT\&T continue to violate the Agreement.

DP\&L will entertain any meaningful offer by AT\&T to settle these matters, and DP\&L would be willing to reassess the suspension at such time. In the event that AT\&T insists on prosecuting its claims, DP\&L hereby proposes the use of binding arbitration through the American Arbitration Association. If binding arbitration is acceptable to AT\&T, we look forward to establishing appropriate parameters within the next 30 days.

Your response by December 15, 2006, including whether binding arbitration is acceptable to AT\&T, would be appreciated. Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please feel free to contact us.


cc: P. Swanks (via e-mail only)<br>P. Guglielmetti (via e-mail only)<br>G. Dawson (via e-mail only)<br>R. Griffin, Esq. (via e-mail only)<br>A. Kendall<br>M. Sullivan, Esq.

Writer's Dhrect Access
Jack Richards (202) 434 -4210 richardsekhlaw.com

December 13, 2006

## Via Electronic and Overnight Delivery

## Michael Sulljivan

Mayer, Brown, Rowe and Maw LLP
71 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606

## Re: Dayton Power and Light/AT\&T

Dear Mr. Sullivan:
This letter follows up on our telephone conversation Monday afternoon. During the call, you noted that our December 6, 2006 letter to your client, AT\&T, proposed binding arbitration to resolve the differences between AT\&T and our client, The Dayton Power and Light Company ("DP\&L"). Prior to any arbitration or litigation, you proposed that AT\&T and DP\&L attempt to resolve our dispute through nonbinding mediation.

As we discussed, nonbinding mediatiori can be effective in situations where both parties are willing to resolve their disagreements on reasonable terms. To date, however, DP\&L believes that AT\&T's position has been at odds with the plain meaning of the Joint Use Agreements, the intent of the parties and 50 years of dealings. With that in mind, we are reluctant to proceed with "nonbinding" mediation, which is why we proposed binding arbitration. Nevertheless, in an effort to move this along, DP\&L is willing to engage in mediation with AT\&T under the following conditions:
(1) Mediation will be conducted in áccordance with the Commercial Mediation Procedures of the American Arbitration Association ("AAA"). If mediation does not resolve this dispute in full within 60 days of the date of this letter, either party may terminate the mediation.
(2) Upon termination of the mediation, either party may initiate binding arbitration within 30 days in accordance with the Commercial Arbitration Rules of the AAA by serving a demand for arbitration on the other party and filing the demand with the AAA. The parties agree to participate in and be bound by such arbitration.
(3) AT\&T must accept this mediation/arbitration offer by Friday, December 15, 2006, which is the date established by DP\&L for AT\&T's response to the December 6, 2006 letter. If you require an extra day or two to consider the matter, please let me know.

# Keller and Heckman lep 

Michael Sullivan
December 13, 2006
Page 2
(4) A written agreement must be executed by the parties by December 22, 2006, which appoints a mediator and an arbitrator (or specifies the method to be used to appoint a mediator and an arbitrator), fixes the locale of mediation and arbitration, determines the extent of discovery for arbitration, apportions the cost of the mediator, arbitrator and AAA fees equally among the parties, and establishes other basic parameters.
(5) Any mediator or arbitrator selected must be an attorney well versed in contract law.

You suggested during our telephone conference that the parties establish a 30-day "cooling off" period, during which DP\&L would lift its suspension and return the parties to business as usual. While we appreciate your offer, DP\&L does not accept it. This dispute has been pending since November 2004, during which time the parties have tried and failed repeatedly to resolve their differences. DP\&L believes that additional measures must be undertaken at this stage to resolve this matter.

Finally, please be advised that DP\&L has retained local counsel to assist with any judicial resolution of this matter. Keller and Heckman LLP will remain primary counsel on this matter, but please provide copies of all correspondence and notices to the following attomeys: :-

Faruki, Ireland \& Cox PL,L.
500 Courthouse Plaza, S.W.
10 North Ludlow Street
Dayton, OH 45402
ATTN: Charles J. Faruki Esq.
(937) 227-3705 (phone)
(937) 227-3717 (fax)
cfaruki@ficlaw.com (e-mail)
ATIN: Jeffrey S. Sharkey, Esq.
937-227-3747 (phone)
(937) 227-3717 (fax)
isharkey@ficlaw.com (e-mail)
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Additionally, it would be appreciated if you would copy my Partner, Douglas J. Behr (202-434-4213; behr@khlaw.com), and my Senior Associate, Thomas B. Mages (202-434-4128; magee@khlaw.com), on any emails, letters or other communications regarding this matter.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Sincerely,


cc: Randall Griffin, Esq.*<br>Charles J. Faruki, Esq.*<br>Jeffrey S. Starkey, Esq.*<br>Thomas B. Magee, Esq.*<br>Douglas J. Behr, Esq.*

* via electronic delivery


## VLAELECTRONIC MAIL AND US. MAI

Jack Richards
Douglas J. Bear
Thomas B. Mage
Keller and Heckmant LLP
10016\$treet, WW.
Suite 500 West
Washington, DC 20001

## Re: Dayton Power and Light / ATBT

## Gentlemen:

Confining our telephone conversation yesterday, AT\&TOBio is not prepared to engage 11 mediation/atiltation under the terms set forth in your December 13 letter. As I explained, as a necessary condition of mediating or arbitrating DPEL must withdraw its purported suspension of AT\&T Ohio's night under the Joint Use Pole \&greement, as such suspension is not authorized by the 'parties' agreement and liteparably harms AT ET Ohio and its customers. You have indicated to me that DP\&L is not whiling to withdraw its suspension

Sincerely,


Michael T. Sullivan

## MTS/ds

cc: Charles J. Faruki, Esq. (via email)<br>Jeffrey S. Sharkey, Esq. (via email)<br>Jon Kelly (via email)<br>Gerald Friederichs (via email)

Beria Brussels Charlotte Chicago Cologne Frankfurt Houston London Los Angeles New York Polo Ale Pars Washington, D.C. Independent Clexico City Correspondent: Jauregud, Nawarrele y Nader S.C.
Dayton Power and Light
FCC Attachment Rate and Pole Ownershlp Cost Calculations
Annual cost of Ownership
0.47578
189.19

15.20
45.01
47.82
24817 PUE 」amid पоzкed
FCC Attachment Rate and Pole Ownership Cost Catculations

|  | 2003 | Ferc Form 1 Reference Work Sheet Reference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Total A\&G | \$ 95,736,143 | Page 323, Line168, Col.(b) |
| 2 |  |  |
| 3 Electric Gross Plant less intangible plant | \$3,639,078,225 | Page 207, Line 34, Col.(g) minus Page 205, Line 5, Col.(g) |
| 4 |  |  |
| 5 Accumulated Depreciation | \$ 1,745,558,547 | Page 219, Line 19, Col. (c) |
| 6 |  |  |
| 7 Accumulated Def Taxes |  |  |
| 8 Account 190 | \$ (74,804,244) | Page 234, Line 18, Col. (c) |
| 9 Account 281 | \$ 527,985 | Page 273, Line 19, Col. (k) |
| 10 Account 282 | \$ 413,226,460 | Page 275, Line 5, Col. (k) |
| 11 Account 283 | \$ 45,338,451 | Page 277, Line 9, Col. (k) |
| 12 | \$ 384,288,652 | Sum of Lines 8 Thru 11 |
| 13 |  |  |
|  |  | Page 323, Line168, Col.(b) |
| 2003 Total General and Admin | \$ 95,736,143 |  |
| Gross plant less Acc Dep less Acc Def Taxes | \$ 1,509,231,026 | Line 3-Line 5 -Line 12 |
|  | 0.06343 |  |

FCC Attachment Rate and Pole Ownership Cost Calculations
Ferc Form 1 Reference Work Sheet Reference

| 1 Account 593 | $\$ 11,507,040$ Page 322, col.(b), Line 119 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 2 |  |
| 3 Pole Investment |  |
| 4 Account 364 | $\$ 146,544,057$ Page 207, col.(g), Line 64 |
| 5 Account 365 | $\$$ |
| 6 Account 369 | $\$ 5,032,138$ Page 207, col.(g), Lina 65 |
| 7 | $\mathbf{9 6 , 8 3 5 , 6 4 4}$ Page 207, col.(g), Line 69 |
| 8 Depreciation on Poles | $\$ 328,411,839$ Sum of Lines 4 Thru 6 |
| 9 Pole Investment | $\$ 328,411,839$ Line 7 |



$$
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 384,288,652 \text { Page 2, Line } 12 \\
& \$ 3,639,078,225 \text { Line } 10 \\
& 10.56 \% \text { Line } 16+\text { Line } 17 \\
& \$ 328,411,839 \text { Line } 7 \\
& \$ 34,680,470 \text { Line } 18 \times \text { Line } 19
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
11,507,040 & \text { Page 322, col.(b), Line } 119 \\
136.201 .891 & \text { Line } 7-\text { Line } 13-\text { Line } 20
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& \mathbf{y} \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& \vdots \\
& N \\
& \mathbf{y}
\end{aligned}
$$

0.08449
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Dayton Power and Light
FCC Attachment Rate and Pole Ownership Cost Calculations
Ferc Form 1 Reference
Work Shoet Reference

## $\varepsilon 00 z$

\$ 146,544,057 Page 207, col.(g), Line 64
$\$ 146,544,057$ Page 207, col.(g), Line 64
$\$ 3,639,078,225$ Page 207, Line 91, Col.(g)


1 Gross Pole Investment (Account 364)
Net Pole Investment

Page 5 of 7
Dayton Power and Light
FCC Attachment Rate and Pole Ownership Cost Calculations
Ferc Form 1 Reference
Work Sheet Reference
ع00Z


$3.58 \%$ Line $5 \div$ Line 7
0.08629
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ In DP\&L's Motion to Dismiss ("Motion to Dismiss") AT\&T Ohio's Complaint, DP\&L explains that the dispute at issue in this proceeding is a contract dispute that falls outside of the Commission's jurisdiction, and that the Commission lacks authority to order the requested injunctive relief. This contract dispute is already before the Montgomery County Common Pleas Court (The Dayton Power and Light Company v. The Ohio Bell Telephone Company, $\mathrm{d} / \mathrm{b} / \mathrm{a}$ AT\&T Ohio, Case No. 06-10306), and that court is fully capable of resolving AT\&T Ohio's contract claims. A copy of DP\&L's Complaint is attached to DP\&L's Motion to Dismiss.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Article XI of the Joint Pole Line Agreement specifies that "[t]he use by one party of the other party's poles is in consideration of the use by such other party of an equal number of poles of the first-mentioned party." Joint Pole Line Agreement, Exhibit A, at Article XI. Article VIII(d) specifies that if the ownership of new poles cannot be agreed upon, "the party then owning the smaller number of joint poles under this agreement shall erect the new joint poles and be the owner thereof." Joint Pole Line Agreement, Exhibit A, at Article VIII(d).

[^2]:    ${ }^{6}$ Joint Pole Line Agreement, Exhibit A, at Article XIII,

[^3]:    ${ }^{7}$ DP\&L's suspension of AT\&T Ohio's right to make new attachments was far less than the sanctions authorized in the contract. Article XIV of the Joint Pole Line Agreement specifies the procedures to be followed in the event that one party defaults in its obligations under the Agreement:
    "If either party shall make default in any of its obligations under this contract and such default continue thirty (30) days after notice thereof in writing from the other party, all rights of the party in default hereunder shall be suspended, including its right to occupy jointly used poles, until such default has been made good ....

    Joint Pole Line Agreement, Exhibit A, at Article XIV (emphasis added).
    ${ }^{8}$ AT\&T Ohio rejected DP\&L's offer of arbitration and proposed instead nonbinding mediation. DP\&L agreed to nonbinding mediation for a two-month period to be followed by binding arbitration, but AT\&T Ohio would not agree unless the suspension was lifted across the board. See Letter from Jack Richards and Thomas B. Magee, Keller and Heckman LLP, to Grace Sury of AT\&T Midwest (Dec. 6, 2006) (issuing Notice of Suspension and proposing arbitration), Exhibit D, at 6; Letter from Jack Richards, Keller and Heckman LLP, to Michael Sullivan, Mayer, Brown, Rowe and Maw LLP (Dec. 13, 2006) (proposing mediation/arbitration), Exhibit E; Letter from Michael Sullivan, Mayer, Brown, Rowe and Maw LLP to Jack Richards, Keller and Heckman LLP, (Dec. 21, 2006) (rejecting DP\&L mediation/arbitration proposal), Exhibit F.

[^4]:    ${ }^{9}$ Accord: Bond v. Bond, 2002-Ohio-3843, 115,2002 Ohio App. LEXIS 3934, at *15 (Ohio Ct. App. 2002). ("The Supreme Court of Ohio has indicated that a mandatory injunction is an extraordinary remedy, and the right to such remedy exists only when there is some fundamental organic right already vested that has been abridged, infringed upon or eliminated.") (citing State ex rel Presley v. Industrial Comm'n of Ohio, 11 Ohio St.2d 141, 153, 228 N.E. 2 d 631, 642 (Ohio 1967)); Buzzard v. Public Emples. Retirement Sys., 139 Ohio App. 3d 632, 638, 745 N.E.2d 442, 446 (Ohio Ct. App. 2000). ("To be entitled to the extraordinary equitable remedy of a mandatory injunction, the moving party must establish that a vested right has been abridged, infringed upon, or eliminated") (citing Presley).

[^5]:    ${ }^{10}$ Rite Aid of Ohio, Inc. v. Marc's Variety Store, Inc., 93 Ohio App. 3d 407, 412, 638 N.E.2d 1056, 1059 (Ohio Ct. App. 1994).; Mead Corp., 93 Ohio App. 3d at 64, 560 N.E.2d at 1324.
    ${ }^{11}$ Ohio Rev. Code § 2727.03, which grants authority to the courts to issue injunctions and provides that injunctive relief is permissible "when it appears to the court or judge by affidavit of the plaintiff, or his agent, that the plaintiff is entitled to an injunction." (Emphasis added.)

[^6]:    ${ }^{12}$ Section 2727.03 of the Revised Code reads as follows:
    § 2727.03. Courts authorized to grant injunctions.
    "At the beginning of an action, or any time before judgment, an injunction may be granted by the supreme court or a judge thereof, the court of appeals or a judge thereof in his district, the court of common pleas or a judge thereof in his county, or the probate court, in causes pending therein, when it appears to the court or judge by affidavit of the plaintiff, or his agent, that the plaintiff is entitled to an injunction. On like grounds and proof, the probate judge may grant injunctions in actions pending in either the court of common pleas or court of appeals of his county, in the absence therefrom of the judges of such courts."
    ${ }^{13}$ Memorandum in Support, at 5 .

[^7]:    ${ }^{14} I d$.
    ${ }^{15}$ Id.
    ${ }^{16} \mathrm{Id}$. at 10 .
    ${ }^{17}$ Joint Pole Line Agreement, Exhibit A, at Article XIII,

[^8]:    ${ }^{18} 47$ U.S.C. § 224(c) (establishing ability of states to preempt FCC jurisdiction over pole attachments with certification that the state itself regulates pole attachments); States That Have Certified That They Regulate Pole Attachments, Public Notice, 7 FCC Rcd 1498 (1992).
    ${ }^{19}$ Following well-established cost of service ratemaking principles, the FCC's cost formula calculates the annual cost of providing and maintaining poles by multiplying the "net cost of a bare pole," which is the depreciated current value of a bare pole, times the pole's annual "carrying charges," which represent (in percentage form) the costs of providing and maintaining the pole during the year. These carrying charges include five familiar elements: administrative, maintenance, depreciation, taxes and return. Amendment of Commission's Rules and Policies Governing Pole Attachments, "Consolidated Partial Order on Reconsideration," 16 FCC Rcd 12103, at Appendixes D-2 and E-2 (2001), aff'd Southern Co. Services, Inc. v. FCC, 313 F.3d 574 (D.C. Cir. 2002) ("Partial Reconsideration Order"). Accord: 47 C.F.R. § 1.1409.
    ${ }^{20}$ Partial Reconsideration Order at Appendixes D-2 and E-2; 47 C.F.R. § 1.1404(g)(1)(v).
    ${ }^{21}$ The fact that the default Deficiency Payment amounts to $\$ 45$ per pole per year is not surprising, considering that it is based on one-half of the annual cost per pole of providing and maintaining Joint Use Poles. For comparison's sake, the FCC's cable-only rate uses the same annual cost of providing and maintaining Joint Use Poles but is based on a $7.4 \%$ allocation factor. Partial Reconsideration Order at Appendix D-2. Thus, the $\$ 45$ Deficiency Payment calculated by DP\&L would amount to a cable-only rate of $\$ 6.61$ per pole per year, which, on information and belief, is fully consistent with FCC regulated cable rates charged by other electric utility pole owners. The $50 \%$ allocation factor used for the default Deficiency Payment under the Joint Pole Line Agreement is easily understood in the context of the purpose underlying the Agreement. This Agreement is not merely renting some small percentage of pole space by one utility to the other - this Agreement is a pole line construction and maintenance agreement under which each utility has agreed to incur $50 \%$ of the costs of installing and maintaining a Joint Use Pole line system across the overlapping service territories.

[^9]:    ${ }^{22}$ Memorandum in Support of Motion at 7.
    ${ }^{23} I d$ at 8 .

[^10]:    ${ }^{24}$ Article XIV of the Joint Pole Line Agreement entitles either party to suspend the other's rights to joint use only "until such default has been made good." Joint Pole Line Agreement, Exhibit A, at Article XIV.

[^11]:    ${ }^{25}$ Memorandum in Support of Motion at 9 .
    ${ }^{26} \mathrm{Id}$.

[^12]:    ${ }^{27}$ Amy Schatz and Peter Grant, AT\&T Yields to Seal BellSouth Deal, Wall St. J., Dec. 29, 2006, at A3.
    ${ }^{28}$ In addition, over the last several months, AT\&T Ohio has actively sought to worsen the imbalance in ownership of Joint Use Poles rather than reduce it. The poles for which AT\&T Ohio seeks an order requiring DP\&L to allow (footnote cont'd...)

[^13]:    (...cont'd)
    joint use are owned by DP\&L and would worsen the ownership imbalance. AT\&T Ohio has been and appears to be unwilling to purchase those poles and some 7,000 others that would be necessary to bring ownership levels back to a $50 / 50$ split.

[^14]:    ${ }^{29}$ A search of both the Time Warner home page and Vonage home page revealed that both companies offer telephone service in and around Dayton, Ohio. Time Warner Cable home page, http://www.timewarnercable.com/ (last visited January 3, 2007). Vonage home page, http://www.vonage.com/avail.php?lid=nav_avail (last visited January 3, 2007).
    ${ }^{30}$ A search of the DIRECTV website and local TV listings, revealed that DIRECTV provides video services to Dayton and surrounding areas. DIRECTV website, http://www.directtv.com, (last visited January 3, 2007); local stations for DIRECTV available in Dayton, Ohio http://www.expertsatellite.com/exp page.php?pg=direct-tv-dayton-oh.htm (last visited January 3, 2007).

[^15]:    ${ }^{1}$ The 1930 Agreement and 1942 Supplemental Agreement will be referred to collectively as the "Agreement."
    ${ }^{2}$ The November 21 Letter responds to letters dated October 26, 2006 and October 27, 2006, from Mr. Randall Griffin of DP\&L's Legal Department to Ms. Sharon Rosiak of AT\&T.

[^16]:    ${ }^{3}$ The November 21 Letter erroneously claims that DP\&L is in default of the Agreement. DP\&L will respond to that claim in a timely manner under separate cover.

[^17]:    ${ }^{4} 1942$ Supplemental Agreement, modification of Article XI (emphasis added).

[^18]:    ${ }^{5}$ December 1952 Operating Routine at Section 11.202 (emphasis added).

[^19]:    ${ }^{6}$ December 1952 Operating Routine at Section' 1.308. The capitalized terms "Signal and Communication Circuits" are undefined.
    ${ }^{7}$ ORC § 4905.71(A).

