

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

January 12, 2010

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 10:35 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Dennis Walls - City of LA -DWP (teleconference)
Ms. Alicia Smith – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Lynn Prescott - Verizon California
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Steve Rodriguez – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Mr. Walls opened the meeting at 10:40 am and addressed the first issue on the agenda, **Item 1462: Section 7.12 OT Costs/disaster replacements**. Southern California Edison brought this issue to the table. Mr. Chow stated that at this time SCE opts to withdraw this item from the agenda. If need be, SCE would re-open this issue with a new item number. This item is now closed.

Item 1487: Review of Authorized Costs line Items is next on the agenda. Mr. Walls stated that the ad hoc was to review items 1 through 19. He added that time did not allow him the opportunity to review the line items. Therefore, he proposed to table this item to allow ad hoc members to review the items.

It was agreed that the ad hoc would concentrate on 1 through 19.

Ms. Hernandez questioned item 9 – Hand Dig. She reported that her organization is receiving JPAs billing Item 9 because the pole is on the property line. She questioned if it is correct that just because a pole is on a property line does not necessarily deem it inaccessible? Mr. Chow responded that she is correct. She stated that she would like the members to know that when receiving Item 9 on JPAs her organization would be questioning if hand dig is necessary and warranted. She added that she had several JPAs that were fielded, and the fielders informed her that hand dig was not necessary.

It was agreed that the members would review the document with items 1-19 in preparation for the next meeting.

Under **miscellaneous items** Mr. Wolfe inquired if SCE and DWP had any information on vendors of lightweight steel poles from the previous meeting.

Mr. Walls stated that he believes the vendor for lightweight steel poles for DWP is Saber.

Mr. Chow stated the vendor for SCE is Valmont
Both DWP and SCE steel poles are galvanized.

Mr. Walls stated that DWP is considering experimenting with Ductile Iron Poles. A company in Tennessee who manufactures water pipes is now manufacturing iron poles. He added that they have similar weight to wood poles, and similar costs to wood poles. They intend on manufacturing this type poles up to 70 feet in height. He added that he would forward the ad hoc members a brochure.

Review of Action Items:

- Ad hoc members to review AC items 1 – 19 with associated work sheet.
- Mr. Walls to send a brochure on Ductile Iron poles to ad hoc members.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m. The next meeting will be scheduled for February 2009.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

February 9, 2010

****Revised****

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 9:00 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Dennis Walls - City of LA -DWP
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Mr. Cory Autrey – Sprint/Nextel
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Steve Rodriguez – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Jeff Wolf – AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Justin Cashmer – Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. Rudy Villavicencio-City of Riverside (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Mr. Walls opened the meeting at 9:10 am and allowed for introductions. He then addressed the first issue on the agenda, **Item 1487: Review of Authorized Costs line Items**. Mr. Walls stated that the ad hoc was to review items 1 through 19. He proposed, in that it has been some time since the ad hoc has met, that the committee review the individual line items to determine if the verbiage is correct, should the verbiage be edited and or revised, and if the item is still relevant to actions performed by members. The individual costs would be addressed in the future.

The members proceeded with Item 1-Trenching or Moving (with and without supply). Mr. Wolfe stated that in his opinion the poles should be grouped by setting depth. He proposed grouping as follows: 30-35, 40-45, 50-55, 60-65, 70-75, 80-85, and 90-95-100. He added that the aforementioned groups are set at the same depth.

Mr. Walls stated that DWP has trenched poles, however, this type of action is performed infrequently. He added that when trenching, the trenching is a limited distance, normally not greater than five feet. At times the decided alternative is to set a new pole rather than trench.

Mr. Autrey remarked that since this task is rarely performed, it would be wise to simplify the costing method.

Mr. Walls stated that the cost for this action could vary greatly therefore, he would support this item as a special agreement.

Mr. Chow stated that he is not aware how frequent this task is performed within SCE, however, when reviewing costs his organization questions the need of these costs. He further stated that he would not be opposed to this item being by special agreement.

Mr. Wolfe stated that he is not opposed to special agreements; however, a special agreement creates difficulty in finalizing JPAs due to the need of authorization.

The discussion returned to grouping by pole setting depth. The consensus is to group costs by setting depths for Items 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Item 5 – Removing from Service was discussed next. Mr. Walls stated that an issue within his organization is the verbiage, “based on 2 cuts” in item 5-(c). He added that this item should be used once only regardless if the cut was one or ten cuts, the cost does not change. He suggested clarification on this item that since there are instances where more than two cuts are required, prompting clerical personnel to charge more than one 5-(c). He proposed adding, “not more than one 5-(C) per pole” for clarification. It was agreed to delete the verbiage, “based on 2 cuts, topping and lowering”.

Item 5-(d) – Disposal has been questioned as to how this cost is calculated. The current cost is \$125 per pole. Mr. Chow stated that he believes disposal is cost based per ton. Mr. Walls stated that he would bring the calculation method for disposal utilized by DWP to the next meeting. The members all agreed to bring their respective disposal calculation methods to the next meeting for review and discussion.

Item 6 – Pole Stubbing. The members discussed their definition of stubbing and steel plates (C-Truss). Mr. Wolfe stated that plate is a misnomer and should read, “truss”. It was agreed to change the word, “plate” to “metal truss”.

Item 7 – Semi-Circular Pole Guards. The suggestion from the prior meeting is to move this item to another section. Mr. Wolfe stated that in his opinion this item should be in the transfer/installation section. After discussion it was agreed to revise 7-A as Item 159, and 7-B as Item 74. Item 7 would remain blank with the notation, “intentionally left blank”.

Item 8 (A&B) – Semi-Circular Cable Guard. It was previously suggested to move this item to another section. However, the consensus is that these items remain as is.

Item 9-Hand Dig Pole Set. The members discussed a, and b of item 9. Mr. Walls clarified that a, or b must be noted on the JPA even if there is no difference in price. The members discussed this item and agreed no changes to Item 9-a, and to place a JPA alert stating, “After construction is completed, should you find a need to add item 9-hand dig due to conflict, specify the condition on either Form 7, Form 48 or both”.

Item 10 – Sidewalk or pavement repairs for placement, replacement, or removal of pole or anchor. Mr. Walls stated that item 10-a is when a utility breaks concrete and temporarily repairs it, and then the second utility permanently repairs it with concrete. Mr. Walls proposed adding a notation stating, “breaking and temporarily repair”. Mr. Chow proposed, “cement break and temporary repair” for 10-a. For 10-C, he proposed, “Cement saw cut break and permanent repair”.

Mr. Wolfe stated that this item section does not address. “Curb, and gutter”, and “handicap ramps”.

After extensive discussion it was agreed to add 10-d to address curb and gutter measured by linear foot, and to agree on how many linear feet would constitute the cost. 10-e would address handicap ramps, and would be based on per square foot to agree on a cost. The consensus is to describe and notate on the pricing matrix what and how members are to base their AC costs for sections 10 A-D. Also discussed was the issue of creating another sub-section to address hard/landscape, or to add to a current subsection.

Item 11-Joints Rights of Way. It was proposed to delete this item since it is rarely utilized. However, the end result is to maintain it in the event that in that rare instance it would be required. No changes to this item

Item 12-Pole Inspections and Treatment. Mr. Wolfe inquired what constitutes a rejection? Mr. Chow responded that he would research the SCE MS 454, but he believes it is a pole that has gone through the various test inspection stages 12-A-D before it is decided that the pole required replacement.

Mr. Autrey inquired where he could gain a definition of what each inspection constitutes?

Mr. Chow responded that this information could be obtained from the SCE MS 454 document.

Ms. Baccus stated that a member inquired how to notate the inspection costs on the JPA, and was using multiple subsection costs.

Mr. Chow stated that on SCE inspection JPAs there is only one inspection cost and not multiple costs.

Ms. Baccus inquired the time interval allowed between inspections. She added that the Routine Handbook (RH) does not address this issue.

Mr. Chow stated that the time intervals between inspections could vary among members; therefore, this could not be addressed in the RH.

It was agreed that this authorized costs would require further extensive discussion in light of the new CPUC ruling. This issue would be discussed at the next meeting, as well as the Routine Revision ad hoc committee.

Item 13 – Pole Access Obstructions. Mr. Chow stated that 13-a is those areas where the state is responsible for fires and fire hazards. There are no changes to 13-a. Item 13-b is to read, “Removal of vegetation to facilitate the placement/replacement/removal of a pole”. There are no changes to 13-c.

There is no change Item 14 – Failure to JPA Administrative Fee.

There is no change Item 15 – Pole Marking.

There is no change Item 16 – Backhoe.

Item 17 – Wood pole fiberglass wrap restoration. Mr. Chow stated that this item continues to be utilized by SCE. Mr. Walls stated that his organization no longer has a need for this item. No changes to this item.

Item 18 – Mod Pole material and installation. Mr. Walls stated that DWP no longer utilizes mod pole installation. Mr. Chow remarked that SCE continues with this practice. No changes to this item.

Item 19 – Cost for placing pole back in the same hole. Mr. Chow stated that historically, DWP was to arrange a field trip for members to observe how

DWP sets a pole in the same hole. Mr. Walls stated that he would set up a demonstration at the DWP training center.

The members would be reviewing items 20 through 49 in preparation for the next meeting.

The next topic for discussion is **Item 1496: Inaccessible Pole Removal**. Mr. Wolfe stated that there are extra components to be considered when pole removal is inaccessible to the normal pulling methods. When a pole is found in this situation the pulling process can be difficult and time intensive. It was suggested to add a subsection to Item 5 to address inaccessibility to pole removal. The subsection would read as follows, "Item 5-E – Pole removal inaccessible to removal equipment".

Under **miscellaneous items** Mr. Rudy Villavicencio stated his concern in regards to time limits on Section 18.1-E. He added that his organization is experiencing problems with poles not being removed within the time limits in the RH. He stated that there are penalty consequences on other sections for non-compliance, but there is no ramifications in regards to pole removals in a timely manner.

Ms. Hernandez responded that this is an issue for the Routine Revision ad hoc committee. She added that the ad hoc members are working on this issue since it has come to the attention of the County of Los Angeles permitting department.

Mr. Wolfe informed Mr. Villavicencio that AT&T California has notified the committee that they now have an improved process to address this issue. He added that the RH was not intended to act punitively however; there are reasonable penalties currently in the RH.

Ms. Hernandez stated that Item 1498 assigned to Routine Revision addresses this issue, and would be discussed at that ad hoc committee.

Review of Action Items:

- Ad hoc members to review AC items 20 – 49.
- Ad hoc members to provide costs of pole disposal.
- SCE to research AC item 17.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for March 9, 2009.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

May 11, 2010

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 9:00 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Dennis Walls - City of LA -DWP
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Steve Rodriguez – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Betty Tenorio – Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless (teleconference)
Ms. Debbie Wouten – NextG Networks (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Mr. Walls opened the meeting at 9:05 am and allowed for introductions. He opened by stating that the ad hoc has previously completed review of items 1 through 19, and would continue with items 20 through 49 at this meeting. Prior to commencing with the review, he opened discussion on an issue raised by AT&T California. The concern is the trussing of poles AC item six. He reported that DWP, when installing “C” trusses that are inaccessible are adding an additional cost via 1.2. He questioned the members if perhaps a cost should be created for this type transaction titled “inaccessible to equipment”.

Mr. Wolfe stated that he reviewed JPAs and would like to ascertain how often this type charge would occur, and prepare and budget for these additional costs. He added that this cost has been addressed within the NCJPA, and inquired if the SCJPC has addressed this issue.

Mr. Chow responded that this ad hoc has not addressed inaccessibility for steel trusses.

Mr. Wolfe stated that what brought this issue to his attention is that the JPAS in question had a 1.2 without approval. He added that he fully understands the need of an additional cost for inaccessibility and has no problem with 1.2.

Mr. Walls stated that if the additional cost for inaccessibility is not an issue for AT&T California, then there is no need for an additional AC item.

However, after further discussion the consensus is to add *AC item 6-I – Inaccessible to Stubbing Equipment*” as another authorize cost to the cost matrix.

Mr. Walls then addressed the first bulleted issue for **Item 1487: Review of Authorized Costs line Items**. He stated that he would state the AC item number, and if any members desired to open discussion, please do so at that time. The block of costs to be reviewed would be AC 20 through 49.

The members then proceeded. There are no concerns with *Item 20-Gud Wires*.

Next discussed is *Item 21 – Crossarms*. Mr. Walls questioned the notes listed below these costs. He stated the notation is not clear. There is the verbiage, “Where the conductors only are being transferred, the conductor price should be doubled”. Mr. Chow stated that the double cost could be connected to the above sentence statement, “the specified conductor price is to be applied only when it is necessary to untie and retie the conductor”, and the double cost is to untie and retie the conductors. Therefore, if there are three conductors, the \$225 would be two times three. The members reviewed the notations, and discussed the notes extensively.

The consensus is to revise the heading on columns one and two, and to add an additional column. The heading on column one would read, “Transfer arm”, column two would read, “Transfer conductor (no splicing), and the third column would read, “Transfer conductor (splicing required).

The first note has been revised by deleting for first two sentences, and maintaining the third sentence only, “Add item 24 for bonding costs”.

The second notation would read, “*NOTES CONCERNING ITEMS 21 AND 22: For strain dead ends on arm, omit specified conductor cost and add Item 22. For Close Buck (Smith Corner) construction, cost of transferring corner arm bracing is extra by field agreement. In triangular or vertical configuration, when circuits are of different voltage or different type of conductor support, apply arm cost for higher voltage involved and respective conductor cost according to voltage. Where circuits are of different ownership, the utility transferring arms and its own circuit will apply both costs*”.

There are no concerns with *Item 22-Dead Ends, and Item 23 – Changing type of constructions*.

Item 24 – Bonding per Pole. Mr. Wolfe questioned if power grounds when bonding equipment. Mr. Walls responded in the negative. There were no other concerns with this item.

There are no concerns with *Item 25 – Ground wire including protective covering*.

Item 26 - Pole Top switches (oil or open air). Mr. Walls questioned if it is necessary to specify the type switches since this is a 1.2 or even list this item at all.

Mr. Chow responded that in his opinion it is a good idea to note it and specify that it is a 1.2. He added if it is removed, then when a pole top switch is removed, there is no need by staff to question how it is handled, since it is noted in authorized costs as a 1.2. There are no other concerns with this item.

There no concerns with Item 27 – Racks and brackets, secondary.

There are no concerns with Item 28 – Service conductors- transferring, raising, or lowering, Item 29- Transformers, and Item 30 – Capacitors and associated Equipment.

Item 31-Street Lights. Mr. Wolfe stated that often street lights are the property of municipalities. He questioned why members would pay a power member for changing street lights.

Mr. Chow responded that in some SCE territories, SCE owns the entire asset. Mr. Walls stated that the asset is owned by the City of Los Angeles. There are no further concerns with this item

There is no concern with Item 32 – Meter or time switch control box.

There is no concern with Item 33 – Supports.

There is no concern with Item 34 – Support, single, dead-end, fiberglass.

There is no concern with Item 35 – Insulator mounting brackets.

Item 36 – Steel cross-arm, squirrel cage bracket, including insulator.

Mr. Wolfe inquired what a squirrel cage bracket is. Mr. Chow stated it has the appearance of a cage, and it supports an insulator. There are no further concerns.

There are no concerns with Item 37 – Double circuit side mount insulators (Dreyfuss Sunburst).

There are no concerns with Item 38 – Insulator assembly bracket for end-arm mountings.

There are no concerns with Item 39 – Insulator assembly bracket for end-arm mountings.

There are no concerns with Item 49 – Transferring, raising, or lowering of power line equipment not listed.

There are no concerns with Item 75 – Crossarms/guard arms- transferring, raising, or lowering, per arm.

There are no concerns with Item 78 – Drive hook with wedge grip unit (P tie), either single drop wire or multiple drop wire including conductor.

Item 79 – Multiple distribution service wire on line pole. Mr. Wolfe inquired the meaning of line pole, and the word line in the sentence as opposed to a service pole.

Ms. Prescott proposed identifying those questionable AC items and revisit them after the AC list of items is complete. She added that she would research the term “Line” in the description upon returning to her office. It was agreed to discuss this item later.

Item 81 – “C” rural wire (1 pair). Mr. Wolfe noted that in 81-A the term “line” is quoted. He added that since this item is for the “C” line and dead-end pole the verbiage is reasonable. There is no further concern with this item.

There are no concerns with Item 82 – Cable are with one cable – transferring, raising and lowering.

There are no concerns with Item 83 – Cable attached direct to pole.

Item 84 – Messenger reinforcing units. Mr. Eastwood questioned the \$9.00 difference between 84-a, and b, since one takes twice the time.

Mr. Walls stated that in the future, it would be helpful if there is a link between the AC item and a picture of the equipment.

Mr. Wolfe stated that he has complied pictures of equipment as an aide for the NCJPA. Mr. Wolfe agreed to send the file with pictures to the SCJPC.

There are no concerns with Item 85 – Messenger without cable – transferring, raising or lowering.

There are no concerns with Item 86 – Messenger dead end, all sized, with or without cable.

There are no concerns with Item 87 – Cable terminal transfer

Item 88 – Multiple distribution wire terminal transfer. Mr. Wolfe stated that he is comparing this item with item 79. It was agreed to research item 88 and 79 for discussion on a relationship between the two items.

There are no concerns with Item 89 – Cable terminal replacement.

Item 91 – Cable splicing, average cost per splice, per pair. Mr. Pranata stated that when the new cost is revised for the new-year; and to arrive at a per-pair cost, she takes the total cost to arrive at the per-pair cost. She added that the results appear illogical. She inquired if it is necessary to publish the per-pair cost? The members submit the total cost, and not the per-pair cost, again she stated that she must back into the per-pair cost.

Ms. Pranata inquired if the splice enclosure disassemble/reassemble cost of \$168.10 embedded in prices should be reviewed?

Ms. Haney stated that she would take the splice enclosure cost back to her vendor to inquire if this cost has changed in the last two years.

There were no further concerns with this item.

There are no concerns with Item 92 – Cable risers, including pipe and molding, each.

Item 93 – Underground and terminal facilities. Mr. Chow inquired as to why there is no cost associated to this item? He added that it appears that a cost could be notated on the JPA and this is what is billed. After brief discussion it was agreed to research the history of this item to ascertain its necessity.

Item 94 – Fiber Optic Splicing/Testing. Mr. Wolfe inquired if the fibers listed are the only sizes available?

Ms. Prescott suggested that the sizes should be raised to a 288 with a notation that any size above 288 is a 1.2. An additional line has been added for a 288 size with a notation, “Any not listed is a 1.2”. It was agreed that this issue would be researched.

Item 96 – Transfer Wireless Equipment. Mr. Rodriguez stated that this description is too general. It was agreed to revisit and further discuss this item at the next meeting for clarification and a breakdown of equipment.

There are no concerns with Item 97 – Transfer meter circuit breaker box/disconnect box.

There are no concerns with Item 109 – Transferring, raising, or lowering of communication not listed.

Mr. Walls concluded the review of this block of costs by stating that the ad hoc would be discussing AC items 110 through 199 at the next meeting; therefore, the members should be prepared.

The second bulleted issue for **Item 1487** is Review and Discuss AC 12-inspections. It was discussed that this issue pertains to the OIR, and the visual inspections. Mr. Chow stated that visual inspections are viewed differently by the power utilities than are viewed by communications. Mr. Rodriguez stated that members met with Mr. Stonerock of SCE, and it was determined what values and items would be exchanged in regards to inspections. The concern is that all utilities are mandated to inspect poles. Mr. Chow stated that the question is what is expected of communication utilities in regards to inspections. The members extensively discussed what issues members would be identifying when visually inspecting poles. Also, discussed is the efficiency and need to avoid redundancy when two members inspect the same pole(s). Mr. Chow stated that until SCE would be allowed to use a communications inspection results, SCE would continue to inspect their poles because they are mandated and being the base owner they are the responsible party. It was agreed that since this was brought to the table

by ATC, and for their benefit, this item would be tabled for further discussion when ATC is present.

The last topic for discussion is **Item 1496: Inaccessible Pole Removal**. Mr. Wolfe reported that his field personnel have brought to his attention the additional work involved when a pole is inaccessible for removal. Therefore, he is proposing an AC for inaccessibility to pole removal. After brief discussion it was agreed to create AC 9-C, "*pole removal not accessible to removal equipment*".

There are no **miscellaneous items**.

Review of Action Items:

- Ad hoc members to review AC items 110 – 199.
- Members to research relationship between AC 79 and AC 88 for next meeting.
- Wireless members to aid ad hoc committee with greater definition for AC 96 for next meeting.
- Committee to research history of AC item 93.
- Committee to discuss further AC item 94.
- SCE to research AC item 17.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for June 8, 2009.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

June 8, 2010

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 1:40 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Scott Hunter - City of LA -DWP
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Alicia Smith – AT&T Local Services
Mr. Cory Autrey – Sprint - Nextel
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Mr. Hunter opened the meeting at 1:45 and addressed the first bulleted issue for **Item 1487: Review of Authorized Costs line Items**. The review started with AC Item 110 – A – Guy wire complete make-up overhead span, or arm guy. There were no concerns with this item or AC Item 110-B.

The members then proceeded to Item 111A-H. Ms. Hernandez questioned if the Routine specifies that the type of anchor should be noted on the JPA? Mr. Hunter stated that in many instances, one does not know initially what type anchor would be required. Mr. Chow stated that if one type is identified initially, and it is changed, the change should be noted on the Form 48. There was no further discussion on this item.

Next for review is Item 112A-D. Mr. Hunter inquired if any members continue to utilize 2” or 3” pipe. Mr. Wolfe responded that AT&T California does continue to do so. No further discussion on this item.

Next for review is Item 115 A-B Heel/Toe Bracing. It was agreed to add Item 115-C Fiberglass blocks, new pole, and Item 115-D, Fiberglass blocks, existing pole to the heel/toe bracing. It was also agreed to add Item 116-C Breast blocking only, new or existing pole-with fiberglass block to this item group.

Item 119-Installation of special guy equipment not listed. The notation language has been changed by adding the verbiage, “Section 1.2”.

Item 120A-N Cross-arms. Mr. Hunter stated that per his personal review, he is suggesting adding fiberglass cross-arms. After brief discussion it was agreed to research the price differential between wood cross-arms and

fiberglass cross-arms to determine if the price is significant enough to warrant an additional cost item, or if the differential is minimum, then there might not be a need to create another item number. Those members that utilize fiberglass cross-arms would research within their organization and return next month with their findings and results.

Item 121 – Pole Top Extensions, including arms (pins and insulators are extra) 6-7 and 8-9. There were no changes to this item.

Item 122- Insulators, including pins and hardware. There was brief discussion on this item but, no changes at this time.

Item 123 – Dead Ends, on arm or direct to pole, per each strain dead end. Ms. Pranata inquired if there are any changes required to the verbiage in the note following this item. The members responded that when costs are submitted, the costs in the notation would be revised.

Item 124 – Racks and Brackets, secondary. There was no discussion or changes on this item.

Item 125-Secondary, neutral ground assembly, complete. This item is to be called: Ground Assembly, complete, with the note reading, “for secondary neutral ground, this item is to be used only by those utilities that have executed agreements for the installation of grounds”.

Item 126 – Support-Single, double, triple and pole top (fiberglass). The members briefly discussed this item for the benefit and clarification of fellow members. Mr. Hunter stated that in his arena the supports are referred to as deer-horns.

Item 127-Support, single dead end, fiberglass. There were no changes to this item.

Item 128 – Insulator mounting bracket. There were no changes to this item

Item 129 – Steel Cross, squirrel cage bracket, including insulator – Single and double. Mr. Wolfe remarked that it would be beneficial to have photographs of the different equipment associated to the costs. Mr. Chow responded that this idea has been discussed historically.

Ms. Pranata presented photographs of poles with equipment provided to the JPC office staff by Mr. Adolph Gonzales of SCE. There were no changes to this item.

Item 130 – Double circuit side mount insulators (Dreyfuss Sunburst). There were no changes to this item.

Item 131 – Insulator assembly bracket for end-arm mounting. There were no changes to this item.

Item 132 – Mounting Bracket-two transformers, three transfers. There were no changes to this item.

Item 149 – Installation of power line equipment not listed. There were no changes to this item.

Mr. Hunter concluded the review of this block of costs by stating that the ad hoc would be completing the review at the next meeting by discussing AC items 160 through 199 at the next meeting; therefore, the members should be prepared.

The second bulleted issue for **Item 1487** is Review and Discuss AC 12-inspections. It was agreed to table this for the next meeting.

On **miscellaneous items** a new item has been assigned. The item number is **1507: 2011 Pole Prices**. Mr. Hunter stated that Mr. Dennis Walls would like to ensure that all pole price costs are submitted by the members no later than September 2010. This item would be discussed at the next meeting.

Review of Action Items:

- Members to research fiberglass cross-arms to determine price differential of wood cross-arms.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for July 2010.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

July 13, 2010

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 12:00 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Scott Hunter - City of LA -DWP
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel
Mr. Steve Rodriguez – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Mr. Hunter opened the meeting at 12:05 and addressed the first issue on the agenda, the **review of the prior meeting minutes**. There were no issues or concerns with the minutes.

The next issue addressed is **Item 1487: Review of Authorized Costs line Items**. The review started with AC Item 160A&BCrossarms/Guard-arms-single wood serv/guard arm and double. It was agreed to add a sub-section to address composite fiberglass guard arm. It was suggested to create Item 161 for guard arms only, separating cross-arms from guard-arms. Items 160 and 161 would be researched and discussed further at the next meeting.

There is no issue with Item 163 Drive Hook with wedge. It was agreed to research Item 164 A – E. Mr. Hunter stated there are three issues to research, cross-arms, guard-arms and cable-arms. These three issues would be clarified at the next meeting.

There is no concern with Items 165, 166 and 167.

It was agreed to remove, “cross” from Item 168.

There is no issue with Item 169 Protective covering-wood or plastic.

The members extensively discussed Item 171 – Install Wireless Equipment. The suggestion is that the wireless members would collaborate to compile sub-sections for the installation of wireless equipment as well as

transfer of wireless equipment. Those wireless members in attendance are satisfied with a special agreement and no cost noted.

Lastly, reviewed is Item 199 Installation of Communication equipment not listed. After reviewing this item, it was agreed to combine 171 (discussed earlier) and 199 under the description of, **“Installation of wireless equipment OR communication equipment not listed: Specify under this item number the nature thereof and the agreed cost under Section 1.2.”**

It was agreed to delete *Item 96- Transfer Wireless Equipment* in that Item 109 encompasses Item 96. Given the choice of deleting 96 or 109, the consensus is to delete 96.

Upon completion of the review, the entire spreadsheet would be sent to the ad hoc members for their final review.

The second bulleted issue to this item is Review and Discuss AC 12- Inspection costs per ruling. This issue would be discussed later.

Next on the agenda is **Item 1494: PTD of Alternative to Wood Poles.** This pertains to the differential costs to PTD a wood pole versus the alternative to wood pole. Ms. Hernandez stated that the ad hoc must decide how to handle any additional costs for removing other than wood poles. It was agreed to table this for further discussion at the next meeting.

On **miscellaneous items** a new item has been assigned. The item number is **1507: 2011 Pole Prices.** Mr. Hunter proposed tabling this issue to the next meeting for the sake of time constraints.

Review of Action Items:

- Ms. Corella to send first draft of reviewed authorized costs to ad hoc members for their final review.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for August 2010.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

August 10, 2010

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 9:00 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Dennis Walls - City of LA -DWP
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel
Mr. Steve Rodriguez – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Mr. Walls opened the meeting at 9:05 a.m. and allowed for introductions. He then addressed the first issue on the agenda, the **review of the prior meeting minutes**. There were no issues or concerns with the minutes.

The next issue addressed is **Item 1487: Review of Authorized Costs line Items**. He opened discussion on fiberglass cross-arms stating that there were questions from the prior meeting. He stated that the 10-foot wood cross-arms cost for DWP is \$37.00, and for fiberglass \$113.00. He added that a 12-foot wood cross-arm is \$41.00, and for fiberglass \$145.00. He concluded by stating that DWP primarily utilizes fiberglass cross-arms and the driver for adding an authorized cost for fiberglass cross-arms.

Mr. Walls then suggested a final review of the entire AC matrix in preparation for sending it out to the membership for completion. The first issue discussed is **Item 5-D**. He questioned if any members had with them their respective methods for calculating the costs of pole disposal.

Mr. Wolfe stated that the vendors in the NCJPA have provided them with their calculating methods and he added that he would share this information with the committee. It was agreed that reviewing the NCJPA method of calculating disposal would be of benefit to the committee.

Next, the members discussed **Item 10-C, D, and E**. After extensive discussion, it was agreed that the originally proposed sections 10-D and 10-E, which were to address curb and gutters, and handicap ramps are not necessary. The aforementioned items could be transacted via special

agreement 1.2. The verbiage, “based on 25 square feet” would be added to item 10-C description.

The members then discussed inspection **Items 12-A, B, C, D, and E**. Ms. Hernandez questioned E –reject. Mr. Wolfe stated that a rejected pole is tagged for replacement scheduling. Ms. Hernandez questioned if A-visual is performed, then B-partial dig is performed, why then is E-Reject billed? Mr. Wolfe added that after A, B and C are performed, one either D-treats the pole, or E-rejects the pole.

Mr. Eastwood stated that the reject cost is for the trip to the field. One could see a reject cost plus another inspection cost if needed.

Ms. Pranata stated that in her experience, she has only seen one inspection cost on JPAs and questioned if it is acceptable with more than one inspection cost. Ms. Hernandez responded that the final has been reviewed by all parties and agreed, therefore, the billing office need not question more than one cost and bill the JPA as received. The consensus is that the inspection costs are not in need of changes at this time.

Next, the members reviewed **Item 17-A-D**. Noted from the last meeting, SCE is to research. Mr. Walls stated DWP does not utilize fiberglass wrap. Mr. Eastwood stated that SCE continues this type transaction. Therefore, it was agreed that no changes are necessary to this cost description at this time.

Item 79 was discussed next. The issue is the term, “line pole”. Mr. Wolfe stated his concern with this term is that he interprets on line with an in line pole or a tangent pole. After discussion, it was agreed that the description does not require revision.

It was agreed to remove the notated cost (\$168.00) on the Note portion of **Item 91**. The note is revised to read, Splice enclosure disassemble/re-assemble cost embedded in prices listed above”.

The question if **Item 93** is necessary was raised. Mr. Wolfe stated that this transactions occurs occasionally, therefore, recommends that it remain in authorized costs. There are no changes to this cost.

It was agreed to add 94-A-7 to **Item 94** to include 288 strand and the note, “Any size above and beyond by special agreement”.

Next discussed is **Item 120**. The issue of adding fiberglass arms to the costs as an additional column was agreed.

The members then discussed **Item 123-Dead Ends**. After extensive discussion it was agreed to add the following sub-items:

(j) 750-7500 volt primary silicone insulators

(k) 11 or 16kv - silicone insulators

(l) 66 to 115kv - silicone insulators

(m) 34kv - silicone insulators

The members are to submit prices for the notation associated with this cost item.

Item 160- Cross-arms/Guard-arms were discussed next. It was suggested to separate cross-arms from guard-arms. The consensus is to create item 161 for guard-arms, and sub-costs of C for CF cross-arm and CF guard-arm.

The last cost discussed is **Item 164-Cable Arm**. The consensus is to create two columns. One column for wooden cable arms and the second column for CF cable arms.

With the final authorized cost review now completed it was agreed to send the matrix to the committee members for their completion, and that the return target date would be September 1, 2010.

Next on the agenda is **Item 1494: PTD of Alternative to Wood Poles.** It has been agreed by the Board members that the setting party is to pull this type pole; however the question remains if the PTD cost for this type pole should be the same as that for wood poles. After brief discussion it was agreed that since PTD costs are not predicated on pole height, that this item number could be closed.

Item 1507: 2011 Poles Prices is next on the agenda. After review of the pole matrix and the definition of elements it was agreed to add another pole completion sheet for Ductile Iron poles. The pole matrix is to be sent out to the members for completion and to be returned to Ms. Corella by September 1, 2010.

On **miscellaneous items** there is one bulleted item, *Review and discuss AC 12 Inspection Costs per ruling.* Ms. Hernandez stated that this pertains to the ruling in the OIR. It was agreed to keep this issue open on the agenda as a place holder upon finality of the ruling.

Review of Action Items:

- Ms. Corella to send final draft of authorized costs matrix to members for their completion to be returned to Ms. Corella by September 1, 2010.
- Ms. Corella to send pole costs matrix to members for their completion to be returned to Ms. Corella by September 1, 2010.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for August 2010.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

October 12, 2010

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 10:30 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Scott Hunter - City of LA -DWP
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon California
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Chuck Johnson – Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel
Mr. Dennis Ennis – T-Mobile USA
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Mr. Kyle Levy – Committee Staff

Mr. Hunter opened the meeting at 10:35 a.m. and stated that since the ad hoc did not meet the prior month, the first agenda item, **review of the prior meeting minutes** would be omitted from this meeting.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1487: Review of Authorized Costs line Items**. Ms. Hernandez noted that very few members submitted their authorized costs. Mr. Chow reported that his organization is still in the process of reviewing costs. Ms. Hernandez added that her organization requires additional time in submitting their costs. She added that she misunderstood the project and was under the impression that this year the costs would be thoroughly reviewed and costs submitted next year. Ms. Prescott agreed with Mr. Hernandez. Ms. Hernandez further added that she has questions and concerns with item 19 that must be determined prior to her organization submitting costs. Mr. Wolfe stated that he submitted his costs to Ms. Corella October 11, 2010.

Ms. Hernandez stated that **Item 19** – Placing pole back in same hole required clarification of what the costs entail. She added historically the item pertained to the differential of placing the pole in the same hole as opposed to alongside. She is requiring an understanding of the components included in this cost. She inquired of Mr. Hunter how DWP arrived at their submitted cost for item 19.

Mr. Hunter stated that he could not at this time since he did not have access to the information at this time. However, he stated that his organization has been charging one half of one AC 5-C and inquired how AT&T California handles this item cost. He added that according to DWP, the cost of topping is not in AC 19.

Mr. Wolfe responded that his organization sees topping as a mutual benefit and agrees to share in the cost.

Mr. Chow stated that he agrees with Mr. Wolfe, however, Ms. Hernandez would like to ensure that item 5-C is not already included in item 19-C. He added that SCE does not include 5-C in 19-C in that there is an item for cuts.

Ms. Hernandez added that SCE does not invoke 5-C with 19-C which led to her assumption that it is included in 19-C.

Therefore, Ms. Hernandez stated that she would like clarification on the elements included in AC 19-C. She questioned the differential between same hole set and set alongside.

Mr. Wolfe explained the additional work entailed in placing a pole in the same hole. Mr. Hunter agreed and stated that it takes approximately an additional three to four hours to set a pole in the same hold as opposed to alongside.

The members discussed the cost of lowering when a PB LTD is noted on a JPA. Ms. Pranata stated in billing, normally, "L" cancels PB. After discussion, it was agreed to revisit the lowering in the LTD in billing for the incoming year since the two actions are not equal in labor hours. **Item 1515: Lowering – 5(E)** has been assigned to this ad hoc. Ms. Hernandez stated that moving forward for now, 5-C would be charged with 19-C.

Item 1507: 2011 Poles Prices is next on the agenda. Mr. Hunter stated that not all pole prices have been submitted. Ms. Hernandez stated that she would be submitting her pole prices soon. The consensus is to table this item for next month. Mr. Hunter announced that those who have not submitted pole prices must submit them to be ready for review by the November ad hoc meeting.

On **miscellaneous items** there is one bulleted item, *Review and discuss AC 12 Inspection Costs per ruling*. Ms. Hernandez stated that this discussion has transpired during the AC review. The consensus is to close this bulleted item.

Review of Action Items:

There were no action items.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for November 9, 2010.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

1400 Montefino Ave, Suite 100

Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Phone (909) 348-5920

Fax (909) 348-5925

November 9, 2010

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 9:00 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Scott Hunter - City of LA -DWP
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon California
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks (teleconference)
Mr. David Callendar – ATC Outdoor DAS (teleconference)
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Mr. Hunter opened the meeting at 9:10 a.m. with a **review of the prior meeting minutes**. There were no questions or concerns.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1487: Review of Authorized Costs line Items**. Mr. Hunter inquired if the members had the opportunity to submit their costs at this time. Ms. Corella reported that she received AT&T California costs and they are included in the current draft copy. However, she added that she received other member costs and did not have the opportunity to include them in the current draft, but would be included in the next draft.

Mr. Eastwood stated that SCE has not completed the review of their costs. He added if the ad hoc is willing to accept SCE costs at a later date he would submit the costs; however, if not SCE would agree to the submitted and approved costs.

After discussion it was agreed to await the final draft, to include all costs submitted by the end of November and to extend the cut-off date to December 15, 2010. The final draft is to be reviewed at the next ad hoc meeting in January 2011.

Mr. Hunter directed Ms. Corella to send an email message to all members that the final date that authorized costs could be submitted for consideration for 2011 would be December 15, 2010.

Item 1507: 2011 Poles Prices is next on the agenda. Ms. Corella reported that this year there are a greater number of members who have opted for the weighted average than in past years. The members agreed to

review the weighted average costs. Mr. Hunter questioned how the 25 foot pole resulted in a greater cost than the 30 foot pole? Ms. Hernandez responded that this question has been raised in the past. She stated that since utilities purchase a greater amount of 30 foot poles, they are given a bulk discount price. The members agreed that this result has been consistent in the past.

Ms. Prescott inquired if the City of Pasadena has submitted their costs. Mr. Corella responded that they have not at this time. It was agreed to contact the City of Pasadena as a reminder about submitting their pole prices in that they have been consistent in submitting their costs in the past.

Ms. Prescott stated that the loaded labor dollars for Verizon California appear low in that the total hours appear minimal. She added that she would attempt to contact Verizon California to question the total number of labor hours. The members reviewed the costs and it was agreed that Ms. Corella would contact the City of Pasadena, and Ms. Prescott would contact Verizon California. The consensus is to present the final pole price draft for approval at the January 2011 administrative board meeting.

Lastly, discussed is **Item 1515: 5-(E)**. This pertains to the lowering in PB LTD. Currently, the lowering is not billed in that the opinion is that the P (pulling) cancels the L (lowering). However, today it appears that P and L are no longer equal in labor costs. Therefore, it was agreed to research and determine a cost for lowering. Mr. Hunter stated that he would research the hours and costs for lowering in contrast to pulling within his organization. He proposed that all members do the same and bring their findings back to the next meeting to determine if a cost for lowering is necessary.

There were no **miscellaneous items** or new item numbers.

Review of Action Items:

- Members to bring their costs for lowering versus pulling.
- Ms. Corella to contact all members that final date for submitting authorized costs is December 15, 2010.
- Mr. Corella to contact the City of Pasadena in regards to submitting their 2011 pole prices.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 9:45 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for January, 2011.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations