

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

1400 Montefino Ave, Suite 100

Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Phone (909) 348-5920

Fax (909) 348-5925

January 11, 2011

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

Mr. Walls 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 reported that he discovered cell formula errors in the cost matrix. Ms. Corella excused herself while she made the corrections to the cost matrix in order to allow the members to review and discuss the correct costs at the meeting.

After the matrix was corrected, the members reviewed and discussed the individual line costs. It was noted that historically, due to the lack of time, there were instances where the committee would take a percentage escalator and apply it to all costs for the incoming year. However, this year it was agreed that all costs would be reviewed per line item individually.

Mr. Chow stated that due to their in house SAP implementation, SCE could not provide costs at this time. Therefore, there are some costs with zero submitted costs. The members discussed deleting the costs, but Mr. Chow stated that when the time for reviewing cost arrives in two years, the costs would require reinstatement. The consensus in this situation is to roll over the 2010 costs into 2011 at this time.

There was extensive discussion on AC Item 9 resulting in revisions to the item on the AC matrix.

After a brief review of the costs, Mr. Walls stated that he noticed some costs incorrect. Therefore, he requested additional time to review his submitted costs.

Mr. Wolfe stated that glancing at the communication submitted costs; he noted that NG submitted a cost for copper cable. He inquired if NG utilizes copper. Ms. Haney responded that the contractor for NG does utilize this cost therefore submits all costs to NG. She added that she would review her submitted matrix and remove those that are not applicable to NG. Mr. Wolfe added that other wireless members submitted this type costs as well.

The consensus is to review the final draft at the next meeting in preparation for Board presentation.

The ad hoc committee then addressed **Item 1507: 2011 Poles Prices**. The members reviewed the weighted average and the individual members submitted costs. There were no questions or comments on the costs. Mr. Wolfe motioned to accept the pole prices as submitted and present to the Board for approval. Mr. Ennis seconded the motion, and all members agreed.

Mr. Chow questioned why some price sheets reflected different versions of draft forms. Ms. Corella responded that some spreadsheets were second drafts, but the entire set of pole prices were draft III. It was suggested that for the sake of consistency, that all sheets reflect the same draft version.

Next discussed is **Item 1515: 5-(E)**. This pertains to the lowering in PB LTD. Mr. Walls stated that per the last meeting, when there is a PB (pull butt) and a LTD (lower, transfer, dispose); the two cancel each other out. However, he added that it has come to the attention of this ad hoc committee that perhaps the two are no longer equal in costs. The members were to research within their organizations the lowering costs versus the pulling costs and return to this meeting with their results. Mr. Walls stated that he would discuss this issue with the DWP staff in preparation for the next meeting. It was agreed to table this item for the next meeting.

Last for discussion is **miscellaneous items**. Mr. Chow opened discussion on **pedestrian traffic control (PTC)** and inquired if members were addressing this issue within their organizations. He added that the purpose for bringing this issue to the table is that SCE launched their program for pedestrian traffic control in terms of training, and identifying this as work required in relation to joint pole action. Therefore, he questioned, should an authorized cost be established for this action? He further added that this could be like flagging. When a pole is placed and removed this involves flagging, therefore, his opinion is that these two actions are similar.

Mr. Ennis stated that his organization is handling PTC in the street use permits and that this is costly.

Mr. Wolfe stated that pedestrian traffic control is a cost that all members incur, therefore questioned if an authorized cost is necessary.

Mr. Eastwood stated that there are ADA ramps that must be set up, and this entails vendors. Mr. Chow added that equipment needed for PTC is not on SCE trucks. He added that he would research what specifics are required in setting up a PTC, and return next month with this information to share with the committee to determine if a cost is warranted. He further added that he would like to discuss how much effort is expended by other members and if it is comparable to the SCE process requirements.

The members discussed their experiences with PTC and it was agreed to create an item number for further discussion on this topic. **Item 1517: AC for Traffic Control/Pedestrian Control** has been assigned to this ad hoc.

Next Mr. Chow raised the issue of block wall repair when pulling butts which was previously brought to the table by Mr. Wolfe. He added that when SCE pulls a butt, they repair block walls when necessary. He further added that he would like to open discussion on creating an AC for the repair. Mr. Wolfe shared an experience where a butt was encumbered by a block wall. The restoration cost for the block wall was steep and he had no desire to enter into litigation with the owners. After extension discussion it was agreed to create an item number for this situation. This item number would be assigned to Routine Revision to document direction for this scenario, and Authorized Costs to determine a cost for this action. **Item 1518: Restoration Hardscape/landscape** was been added to this ad hoc committee and the Authorized Costs ad hoc committee for further discussion.

Review of Action Items:

- Members to bring costs for lowering to discuss in regards to Item 1515: Pricing for Lowering.
- Members to evaluate Traffic Control process within their organization in preparation to discussion.
- Place Pole Prices on Board discussion calendar for possible Board approval.
- AC Matrix to be revised by DWP

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for February, 2011.

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

February 8, 2011

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 1:00 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Mr. Jeff Wolf – AT&T California
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)
Mr. Chuck Johnson – Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

In the absence of the City of Los Angeles, who chairs this ad hoc committee, Mr. Wolfe substituted and opened the meeting at 1:10 p.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. Wolfe stated that the members would be reviewing Authorized Costs Draft V. He stated that in his review of the average submitted costs versus the current cost, he did not notice a great disparity in costs increase.

Those line items that had no costs submitted for the incoming year would revert to the 2010 costs.

The members reviewed the final draft and made minor revisions. It was agreed that the Final Draft was ready to be presented to the Board for discussion and possible approval.

Next discussed is **Item 1515: 5-(E)**. This pertains to the lowering in PB LTD. Ms. Hernandez stated that historically, when there is a PB (pull butt) and a LTD (lower, transfer, dispose); the two cancel each other out. However, she added that it has come to the attention of this ad hoc committee that perhaps the two are no longer equal in costs. It was agreed

to place this item on the Discussion calendar of the next Administration Board meeting to determine if the Board members concur with this committee.

The fourth topic for discussion on the agenda is **Item 1517: Traffic Control/Pedestrian Control**. Mr. Eastwood stated that this expense is now provided by SCE. He added that the purpose of bringing this issue to the table is to determine if other members are now bearing the cost of pedestrian/traffic control. He further added that SCE is now contacting vendors for the wheel chairs ramps required on corner curbs since SCE does not have this equipment on their trucks.

After brief discussion it was agreed to bring this item to the Administrative Board meeting and place it on the agenda under Known Items to ascertain if any Board members are also now bearing this cost as is SCE.

The fifth issue on the agenda is **Item 1518: Restoration Hardscape/landscape**. This item pertains to removal of a pole behind a block wall or a pole surrounded by a wall, and the cost to restore the wall. It was agreed to add verbiage to AC 13-C to read, "*such as landscape/hardscape restoration*". This would be placed on the discussion calendar of the next Administrative Board meeting for discussion and approval.

Last for discussion is **miscellaneous items**.

There were no miscellaneous items for discussion.

Review of Action Items:

- Place Item 1487: Authorized Costs Final Draft on Board discussion calendar for possible Board approval.
- Place Item 1515 on Board discussion calendar
- Place Item 1517 on Know Items calendar
- Place Item 1518 on Board discussion calendar

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for March, 2011.

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

March 8, 2011

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 9:10 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

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

Mr. Hunter opened the meeting with a **review of the prior meeting minutes**. There were no questions or concerns.

The first assigned item for discussion is **Item 1515: 5-(E)**. This item was on discussion at the last board meeting. There was no major discussion or resolution, therefore, it was returned to this ad hoc. Mr. Wolfe commented in his opinion that incrementally lowering is less labor intensive than pulling the butt. He added that to arrive at a set cost for lowering would entail taking the number of employees and the time it takes to cut the pole into manageable pieces. Mr. Wolfe stated that if the pulling party removes all but five feet of pole, the pulling party gets compensation for pulling, and that AT&T as the lowering party lowers and removes the remaining five feet of pole; AT&T does not expect compensation in these instances. He added if the remaining piece of pole is greater than five feet, then there is consideration for compensation.

Mr. Walls stated that in his opinion, both tasks entail the same amount of time; however, there can be isolated cases for both pulling the butt and lowering the pole. He added that he is not certain if there is a

method of identifying an authorized costs that could address all instances equitably. After further discussion, it was agreed that no changes should be made to AC 5, and that isolated instances could be handled via 1.2. The consensus is that these costs remain as is, and close this item at this time.

The third topic for discussion on the agenda is **Item 1517: Traffic Control/Pedestrian Control (PTC)**. Ms. Corella sent a document provided by Mr. Eastwood of SCE to all members (see attachment). Mr. Wolfe commented that the standards and guidelines for PTC appear reasonable. Mr. Eastwood stated that the primary intent of SCE is to determine if other members are handling PTC in a similar manner as SCE. He added that this is a practice for every two hour plus job. The members discussed the methods required for PTC. Mr. Chow stated that the question posed within his organization, is if other members have a PTC program and if they are willing to share in the cost of PTC. If the members choose not to share in this cost, than perhaps this item could be closed. Mr. Eastwood stated that his intent is to inform all members that SCE would be implementing PTC into every SCE job order. He added the only exception would be if the job is under 2 hours or there are no pedestrian sidewalks in the area. The members agreed to share in instances where the work is being shared and PTC is required. Ms. Prescott stated that if the PTC is merely to satisfy SCE requirements, she is not certain if she would agree to share in the cost. After extension discussion, it was agreed that this issue served as a notification to fellow members that SCE would be addressing PTC with a large majority of their work orders. It was agreed to close this item.

The fourth issue on the agenda is **Item 1518: Restoration Hardscape/landscape**. Mr. Hunter stated that at the last meeting, Mr. Chow commented that a majority of restoration costs are between \$800.00 and \$900.00. He added that he attempted to determine a fixed cost for those aforementioned restorations. He then proposed for the sake of example, the amount of \$1,000.00 as the authorized cost for minor restoration, and anything above this amount as a 1.2. However, he then questioned about those instances when the restoration is substantially less than \$1,000.00; in these instances members could be compensated for a greater amount than the actual cost. Mr. Wolfe agreed that it is very difficult to arrive at a fixed cost for restoration since there are many degrees of restoration. Ms. Haney stated that the initiating party could attach an estimate to the preliminary JPA and the owners could agree on a shared cost. The members agreed that an attached invoice/estimate could aid the other owners in determining and agreeing on a shared cost. Mr. Hunter reiterated that in his opinion determining and agreeing on a fixed cost that is equitable in all instances is near impossible. After extensive discussion it is agreed to add the following verbiage to AC 13-C, "such as landscape/hardscape restoration written estimate required". This addition to the authorized cost will be published and become effective immediately. This item is now closed.

Last for discussion is **miscellaneous items**.

There were no miscellaneous items for discussion.

Review of Action Items:

There were no action items.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for April, 2011.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

Attachment

SCE PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC CONTROL

When is Pedestrian Traffic Control required?

Where the SCE construction/work site encroaches on public right of way and reduces the existing pedestrian path of travel to less than 48” wide and the crew will require more than 2 hours to complete their work.

When is Pedestrian Traffic Control not required?

On Construction sites where:

1. Inspection, construction or routine maintenance of electric facilities is being performed in 2 hours or less.
2. SCE did not originate the construction work and SCE does not encroach in the public right of way.
3. SCE is not responsible for the permitting of the final construction site and SCE work does not encroach in the public right of way.
4. The Troubleshooter or crew is involved in an emergency response situation. This would typically be at the first response stage. Once repair work begins the PTC requirements must be met if the job will require more than 2 hours of crew work.
5. The area is not improved (e.g. no sidewalks, not a marked/dedicated pedestrian right of way, not paved. Ect.)

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

1400 Montefino Ave, Suite 100

Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Phone (909) 348-5920

Fax (909) 348-5925

April 12, 2011

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:

Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Ennis – T-Mobile USA
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles - DWP
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles – DWP
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Mr. Steve Garcia – ExTeNet Systems
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)
Mr. Chuck Johnson – Verizon California (teleconference)
Mr. David Callender – ATC Outdoor DAS (teleconference)
Ms. Debbie Wooten – NextG Networks (teleconference)
Ms. Jane Chung – NextG Networks (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Mr. Walls opened the meeting with a roll call. He then asked members to review **the prior meeting minutes**. There were no questions or concerns.

There are no assigned items to this ad hoc committee, therefore, the members opened with **miscellaneous items**. Mr. Chow opened by stating that SCE is constantly revising their inspection program and updating the processes. He stated that initially with GO 165, SCE aggressively fiber wrapped and steel stubbed poles. As a result, ten years have lapsed since these poles have been reinforced and SCE is now returning to inspect the shell thickness of these poles. These poles would either pass or fail, and this is a different classification of inspection in their inspection program. What differentiates this inspection is the cost that is not comparable to the current costs in AC 12. To this, Mr. Chow is proposing implementing another sub-cost to AC 12 for re-inspection. He added that this type of inspection is greater labor intensive due to the many locations on the pole which are sound and bored. He added that this cost would average approximately

\$53.00 per pole. He further added that if this proposal is Board approved, he would like it to become effective immediately.

Mr. Chow stated that he would like members contacted to provide their respective costs for this type of re-inspection. After discussion it was agreed to have members reply to this request by no later than May 2nd. The consensus is to assign an item number to this issue. **Item 1524: Re-inspection of Reinforced Poles** has been assigned to this ad hoc committee.

Mr. Wolfe inquired where the shell thickness of the pole would be inspected. Mr. Chow responded that the drilling would be at ground level, above the repair. The steel stub would be where ever there is a set of bands that hold the steel stub. Nothing below ground level would be inspected.

Mr. Wolfe further inquired the length of time the entire project would take. Mr. Chow responded that he does not have a forecast at this time, but this project was started last year, and approximately 10,000 poles were inspected last year. Mr. Wolfe then inquired if the members could get a monetary forecast. Mr. Chow responded that he could obtain a forecast of those members which would be largely impacted and work on a reasonable schedule.

This issue would be discussed further at subsequent meetings.

Review of Action Items:

- Ms. Corella to contact members and request they submit their respective costs for re-inspection of reinforced poles and reply by no later than May 2nd.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 9:20 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for May 10, 2011.

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

May 10, 2011

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:

Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Ennis – T-Mobile USA
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles - DWP
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles – DWP
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Mr. Steve Garcia – ExTeNet Systems (teleconference)
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)
Mr. Chuck Johnson – Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Mr. Walls opened the meeting with roll call of those in attendance and those teleconferencing. He then asked members to review **the prior meeting minutes**. There were no questions or concerns.

The second issue on the agenda is **Item 1524: Re-inspection of Reinforced Poles**. Ms. Corella sent out an email request to all members soliciting any information on costs that pertain to the re-inspection of reinforced poles. Those members responding are AT&T California, City of Los Angeles, AT&T Mobility, and Verizon California. All responded that they currently do not partake in this type of inspection; therefore have no costs to submit to the ad hoc committee.

Ms. Hernandez stated that she missed this discussion at the last ad hoc meeting and inquired of SCE that difference in re-inspecting reinforced poles as opposed to the current authorized costs in place.

Mr. Chow responded that this type inspection is a different type of inspection as opposed to those currently in authorized costs. He added that this inspection is more intrusive, and they must drill to test thickness in multiple places on the reinforced pole. It is applicable only to poles with a fiber glass wrap or a steel stub. Mr. Wolfe inquired approximately how many drills are applied. Mr. Chow responded that there is a minimum of three,

depending on the height of the steel stub, and how many sets of ban around the pole.

Mr. Chow stated that included with his cost proposal is that, if approved, he would like the cost to be effective immediately since authorized costs are not visited but every two years.

Mr. Wolfe inquired if this type inspection would follow the cycles that other type inspections adhere to. Mr. Chow responded that this type inspection is on a ten year cycle. Mr. Chow stated that this type inspection would be indentified on the pole records by its unique cost item number.

Ms. Prescott inquired if Edison's approved inspection program includes this type of inspection. Mr. Chow stated that this type inspection would be an addition to the inspection program originally submitted by SCE, and is filed with the JPC office. He added that he would research within his organization and get an updated copy of the SCE inspection program to keep on file with the JPC office.

Mr. Johnson inquired if SCE is aware of the number of reinforced poles that would be re-inspected? Mr. Chow responded that he believes the number is about 10,000 poles. He added that he would further research this number.

The proposal is *Item 12-(f)-Re-inspection of reinforced poles at the cost of \$53.00 (see attachment)*. It was agreed that this proposed inspection cost would be placed on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting for discussion, and possible Board approval.

Lastly, on the agenda are miscellaneous items. There were no miscellaneous items at this time.

Review of Action Items:

- Item 1524: Re-inspection of Reinforced Poles to be place on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 9:20 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for June 2011.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

Attachment

(a) Pulling.....per pole	805
*includes 1 hour pre-planning and engineering	
(b) Transporting.....per pole	251
(c) Topping Pole.....	287
*based on topping and lowering.	
(d) Disposal.....per pole	172
*effective 07/01/02	
6. Pole Stubbing (stub-size):	
(a) 8 ft. metal truss.....	400
(b) 10 ft. metal truss.....	538
(c) 11 ft. metal truss.....	802
(d) 12 ft. metal truss.....	804
(e) 13 ft. metal truss.....	1385
(f) 14 ft. metal truss.....	2064
(g) 15.5 ft. metal truss.....	2388
(h) additional metal trusses (all sizes).....	254
(i) Inaccessible to stubbing equipment.....	61
7. Intentionally left blank	
8. Semi-circular pole guards:	
(a) Installation.....	135
(b) Transferring.....	118
9. Hand Dig/Hand Removal	
.....	
(a) Inaccessible to digging equipment	
(b) Accessible with Conflict-Must specify nature of conflict	
(c) Pole removal not accessible to removal equipment	
10. Sidewalk or pavement repairs for placement, replacement, or removal of pole or anchor:	
(Permit and/or inspection fees, if any, are by special agreement) (See also JPR Section 19.6)	
(a) Cement break and temporary repair.....	514
(b) Asphalt break and repair.....	354
(c) Cement saw cut break and repair. Based on 25 square feet.....	723
11. Joint Rights of Way: (By special agreement)	
12. Pole Inspections and Treatment	
(a) Visual Inspection.....	34
(b) Partial Dig.....	40
(c) Sound and Bore.....	34
(d) Full Treatment.....	52
(e) Reject.....	33
Note: May only be billed once every 5 years. (Effective May 2011)	
(f) Re-inspection of reinforced poles (may only be billed once every 10 years, effective MM/DD/YYYY).....	53

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

1400 Montefino Ave, Suite 100

Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Phone (909) 348-5920

Fax (909) 348-5925

July 12, 2011

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:

Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Ennis – T-Mobile USA
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles - DWP
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Networks
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)
Mr. Chuck Johnson – Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. David Callender – ATC Outdoor Das (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Mr. Hunter opened the meeting at 9:00 am. In that there are no minutes for review he then inquired if there were any issues for miscellaneous items.

Mr. Wolfe opened discussion on select back fill. He added that on permits, one might be requested to back fill with a specific type of filler. He added that some members in the NCJPA utilize different types of fillers. Mr. Hunter responded that he does not reminder any conversation concerning back fill within the SCJPC.

Mr. Wolfe added that there are some municipalities that require certain type back fill, and if costly there should be some discussion on a shared cost. Mr. Hunter stated that his organization normally absorbs the cost. He added that in his opinion, if a cost of this sort is exorbitant, then it could be handled via section 1.2; therefore he believes this issue does not require an authorized cost. The members agreed.

Review of Action Items: No action items.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 9:10 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for August 9, 2011.

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

August 9, 2011

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 11:00 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility (teleconference)
Mr. Dennis Ennis – T-Mobile USA
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles - DWP
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff

Mr. Hunter opened the meeting at 11:05 am. In that there are no minutes for review he addressed the agenda.

The first item on the agenda is **Item 1531: 2012 Pole Prices**. The members reviewed the packet which contained the pole price matrixes and definition of elements. The members discussed the total hours for planning and engineering, digging and erecting, and transport and handling. The committee reviewed and discussed each column heading of the matrix. Mr. Hunter requested that a line for 110' wood and lightweight steel be added to the pole matrix. Ms. Pranata would add the additional pole lengths prior to sending the matrix out to the membership.

Mr. Hunter stated that his organization has not purchased any ductile poles just yet, in that they are in the testing phase. However, he added that his organization is pleased with this type pole. In conclusion, when the additional pole length lines are added to the wood and lightweight steel, the matrix would be sent out to members due back by September 30, 2011 so the ad hoc committee could discuss the submitted costs in preparation for board approval.

Under miscellaneous items Mr. Chow opened discussion on **cost causer**. He stated that his objective is to arrive at a method of billing PG&G per transaction. He added that in operating a cost was created for billing outside entities when records and other documents are requested. An hourly rate and cost of materials was agreed upon by the ad hoc operating committee. He suggested that perhaps an authorized cost could be created to bill entities that are no longer active members of the SCJPC. He further

added that PG&G poles could be removed from the pole database through attrition; however, this process would prove lengthy. Therefore, he further suggests that a cost could be recovered for the continued maintenance of these poles in the SCJPC pole database. Another option is to back out the PG&E poles from the SCJPC database and SCE would maintain the poles in their database. When questioned, Mr. Chow responded that there are approximately 800 joint poles between SCE and PG&E. Mr. Wolfe stated that in his opinion he sees value in maintaining these poles in the SCJPC database. Mr. Chow stated that what is needed is a cost for processing the paper work, and a fee for maintaining these poles in the database. He further added that SCE would prefer an ownership rather than a lease agreement with SCE and PG&E. Those poles with VZ and H would require an outside of the committee agreement which would not reflect on the Form 44. In conclusion, Mr. Chow would like this ad hoc committee to consider a cost causer for processing the paper work at the JPC office and maintaining the pole record. Mr. Hunter suggested having members that are not full members, but associate members. The members discussed the possibility of other entities that could benefit from an associate type membership which might include the City of Ontario, and Sempra. These entities would attach meter tracking devices only on poles.

It was agreed to discuss a cost causer at the operating committee level.

Review of Action Items:

- Ms. Pranata to add pole lengths to the pole matrix and send the pole matrix to members to be returned by September 30, 2011.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for September 14, 2011.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

It was agreed to send out the pole prices matrixes out to the members with a return deadline date of September 30, 2011.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

1400 Montefino Ave, Suite 100

Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Phone (909) 348-5920

Fax (909) 348-5925

September 13, 2011

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 Ennis – T-Mobile USA
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Mr. Adolph Gonzales – Southern California Edison
Mr. Dennis Walls – City of Los Angeles - DWP
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison
Ms. Maryan Farajzadeh - City of Vernon (teleconference)
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Mr. Walls opened the meeting at 9:10 am and inquired if the members had any revisions or comments on the prior meeting minutes. A typo was noted and corrected. There were no further comments on the minutes.

The next item on the agenda is **Item 1531: 2012 Pole Prices**. Ms. Corella reported that she has received two pole prices at this time, however; the cut-off date is September 30, 2011. Mr. Chow stated that his organization is completing the matrix. Mr. Wolfe stated that his organization would submit their costs by the cut-off date. This item is to remain open.

Mr. Walls inquired if there were any **miscellaneous items**. Mr. Ennis stated that he would like to propose discussion on a new AC item based on the loss of revenue for wireless entities. He added that this would pertain to situations when a plant-damage is not addressed and handled in a timely manner. He added that a pole was recently replaced, but it took a great length of time to regain service to the cell site. He stated that it appears to him that if there are monetary consequences to these type delays, the process would be expedited. Therefore, he is proposing an authorized cost for loss of revenue for wireless members.

Mr. Wolfe interjected and stated that prior to considering an authorized cost; the situation in question should be discussed in detail within the Routine Revision ad hoc committee.

It was agreed to bring this issue and concern to the next Routine Revision ad hoc committee.

Next, Mr. Wolfe stated that when planners, spotters, and engineers are inspecting poles in the field for pole replacements; if a pole has been trapped by a private or public improvement, the JPA initiator has an obligation to note on the JPA with a sketch attached so one is able to prepare for this situation. He added that in many instances, the obstruction is a block wall. He further added that this wood cannot be left in the field. He concluded by stating that he would like this issue discussed further in the Routine Revision ad hoc committee.

Review of Action Items:

- Send out reminder of pole price submission deadline of September 30, 2011.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 9:20 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for October 11, 2011.

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 8, 2011

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 Ennis – T-Mobile USA
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison
Ms. Lynne Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Robert Wolfe – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Michael Wolf – AT&T California (teleconference)
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility (teleconference)
Ms. Tamara Henderson - AT&T Mobility (teleconference)
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Mr. Hunter opened the meeting at 9:15 am. The Authorized Costs Elements ad hoc committee did not meet in October; therefore, there were no minutes to review.

The next item on the agenda is **Item 1531: 2012 Pole Prices**. The members reviewed the first draft of the submitted pole costs. It was noted by all that the costs submitted by Verizon California and included in the weighted average were very low in relation to the other costs submitted. Ms. Prescott stated that the hours for transporting, handling, digging and erecting were very little hours, or not multiplied by the total number of personnel in a crew. She is concerned that perhaps Verizon is not compiling the hours times personnel. In that they chose to be included in the weighted average, Verizon's costs are skewing all other submitted costs and bringing down the weighted average substantially. Ms. Corella stated that the member(s) that set the greatest number of poles in the previous year within the weighted average group, bears the greatest weight, thus having their costs reflected the greatest in the overall average. The members reviewed prior year's costs submitted by Verizon California and noted that they were relatively low even then.

After discussion it was agreed to contact Verizon California to ensure that their total labor hours are correct. It was also agreed to place draft one

of the pole prices on the discussion calendar of the next board meeting, and Verizon California may opt to change their costs or maintain them as they were originally submitted. Ms. Prescott commented that if Verizon opts to maintain their originally submitted costs some members may opt to publish their costs individually and not be included in the weighted average.

It was agreed to place this item number on the discussion calendar of the next board meeting for discussion. Verizon California will have the opportunity to change or maintain their costs. The members reviewed the remaining costs. Ms. Prescott suggested that the City of Pasadena be contacted and inquire if they plan on submitting costs.

Mr. Wolfe noted that LAC and ATC costs are identical. Ms. Prescott responded that many organizations utilize similar contractors. Mr. Chow revised SCE fiberglass pole prices for SCE. Mr. Wolfe increased transport and handling by one hour for the submitted costs by AT&T California.

The members discussed the agreed upon issue in regards to other than wood costs. If a member does not submit a pole cost for alternative to wood, a member is allowed to revert to the past costs back to five years. It was noted that any members that fails to submit wood pole prices would default to the wood weighted average cost for that given year.

Mr. Hunter inquired if there were any **miscellaneous items**. There were no miscellaneous issues for discussion.

Review of Action Items:

- Contact Verizon California in regards to submitted costs
- Contact City of Pasadena to inquire if they intend on submitting costs.
- Place Item 1531: 2012 Pole Prices on the discussion calendar of the next Board meeting.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for January , 2012.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations