

## SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

1400 Montefino Ave, Suite 100

Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Phone (909) 348-5920

Fax (909) 348-5925

January 10, 2012

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  
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (teleconference)  
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility (teleconference)  
Ms. Tamara Henderson – T-Mobile USA (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 and announced that Mr. Dennis Walls is no longer an SCJPC member representative for the City of Los Angeles. Mr. Walls has been transferred and will supervise a DWP district.

He then inquired if the members had an opportunity to review the minutes from the prior meeting, and if so, are there any required revisions. In that there were no comments. Mr. Hunter addressed the first item on the agenda.

**Item 1531: 2012 Pole Prices** is the first agenda item. The members reviewed draft III of the submitted pole prices. It was noted that at the last meeting in reviewing pole prices draft II, the weighted average was relatively low due to the VZ submitted costs. Ms. Corella stated that VZ has re-submitted their revised costs which are reflected in draft III and the result is higher weighted average costs. The members then reviewed the revised costs. There were no questions or issues with the revised costs. In that the 2012 proposed pole costs have been agreed upon by this ad hoc committee, the costs will be on the discussion calendar of the next meeting for discussion and possible board approval.

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

Review of Action Items:

- Item 1531: 2012 Pole Prices to be placed on the discussion calendar of the January board meeting agenda.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 9:25 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for February 14, 2012.

---

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 14, 2012

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  
Ms. Shawn Henderson – T-Mobile USA (teleconference)  
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Mr. Steve Brown – City of Los Angeles - DWP  
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California  
Mr. Michael Wolf – AT&T California (teleconference)  
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility  
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath  
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services  
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)  
Ms. Tracey Province – Verizon California (teleconference)  
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff  
Ms. Jaclyn Lensch – Committee Staff  
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Mr. Hunter opened the meeting at 9:05 am and allowed for introductions. He then inquired if the members had an opportunity to review the minutes from the prior meeting, and if so, are there any required revisions. In that there were no comments. Mr. Hunter addressed the first item on the agenda.

**Item 1546: Transfer of Ownership Administrative Costs.** This issue pertains to the additional administrative costs that members are incurring due to the special process required to transfer ownership from Sprint to NextG. It is proposed to create a cost to cover this labor intensive task. Mr. Ennis stated that this process of transferring ownership from Sprint to NextG is expending member's resources and members should receive some type of compensation via a cost causer or JPA. It was discussed how the costs should be calculated. Ms. Pranata stated that when ownership is changed from Sprint to NextG on record and are only two members on a pole, it is not too difficult; however, if both these members are on the same pole there is the additional task of combining the space and

grade and recalculating percentages. The members discussed finding a unit of measurement to be applied to an authorized cost. Mr. Ennis stated that the best method for this type transaction would be via a JPA. In her opinion, Ms. Hernandez stated that the best and most efficient process for this type transaction is the current process in place and that is via a JPA. Mr. Eastwood stated that his organization identifies the poles in question on a spread sheet. He inquired if the spreadsheet could be attached to the JPA. It was noted that the JPA is limited to no more than 100 poles. It was reported that initially this was a special agreement by the members to process this partial transfer from one member to another. It was originally thought that a 1.2 was the easiest and simplest method for this type transaction since no compensation was needed. In that this scenario might present itself again, it was agreed to set precedence for future members with a similar situation. After extensive discussion, it was agreed that there is a current process in place to address transfer of ownership and that is via a JPA section 4.2. It is noted in these minutes that when there is a partial transfer of ownership on a block of poles, from one member to another member, that it must transpire via the JPA process. Also discussed is the issue of the purchasing members paying twice for the pole(s). This would require a 1.2 special agreement that the purchasing member not pay that member whose poles were purchased via a contractual agreement, only pay those members not involved in the contractual agreement. This would give the JPC office billing direction. This item is now closed.

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

Review of Action Items:

- There are no action items.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for March 13, 2012.

---

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 13, 2012

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  
Ms. Shawn Henderson – T-Mobile USA (teleconference)  
Ms. Tracey Province – Verizon California (teleconference)  
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Mr. Steve Brown – City of Los Angeles - DWP  
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (teleconference)  
Mr. Michael Wolf – AT&T California (teleconference)  
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility  
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath  
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services  
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel (teleconference)  
Ms. Tracey Province – Verizon California (teleconference)  
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff  
Ms. Jaclyn Lensch – Committee Staff  
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Mr. Hunter opened the meeting at 9:00 am and asked if the members had reviewed the minutes from the prior meeting. There were no comments or questions on the previous meeting minutes.

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

Review of Action Items:

- There are no action items.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 9:05 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for April 10, 2012.

---

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

April 10, 2012

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  
Ms. Shawn Henderson – T-Mobile USA (teleconference)  
Ms. Tracey Province – Verizon California (teleconference)  
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Mr. Steve Brown – City of Los Angeles - DWP  
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California (teleconference)  
Mr. Michael Wolf – AT&T California (teleconference)  
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility  
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath (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. Jaclyn Lensch – Committee Staff  
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff

Mr. Hunter opened the meeting at 9:05 am. This ad hoc met last month, however, there was no agenda and no miscellaneous items brought to the table.

Mr. Hunter inquired if there were any **miscellaneous items**. Mr. Chow opened discussion by stating it is agreed that when members identify work performed on a JPA, they are compensated accordingly to the authorized costs. He continued stating that he is of the opinion a cover page, or the like of, should be included in the authorized costs section clarifying that these costs are shared when the work has actually been performed, and he emphasized actually. He added that SCE is encountering instances where authorized costs are identified on JPAs, with the objective of lessening credit due SCE. He shared instances where splicing was identified on the JPA and when SCE did their field check, the work had not been performed. He concluded that in his opinion the issue of cost sharing should be clarified and stated in association to authorized costs. He reiterated that in some instances it is many years before the SCE field check transpires; and even then the work is not performed.

The members discussed where within authorized costs this clarification notice would be inserted. Mr. Chow stated that this issue is not notated anywhere in the Routine, therefore, those who are newer to the committee may not be aware that excess costs for work not truly performed cannot be applied to a JPA. He further added that although, this is common knowledge amongst the seasoned and regular attending members, newcomers may not be familiar and/or aware. Mr. Chow suggested a footnote on the authorized cost pages. He added that he would create the verbiage for the footnote. Mr. Hunter suggested a cover sheet. In conclusion, Mr. Chow to provide the verbiage for the clarification notice.

The members discussed **pole set in the same hole**, and agreed that a clear and concise definition of what constitutes this transaction is necessary. It was suggested that a meeting of the members and their construction personnel could aid in identifying the criteria for pole set same hole. A special meeting to discuss this issue has been scheduled for May 8<sup>th</sup> prior to the ad hoc meetings of that day.

#### Review of Action Items:

- Ms. Corella to notify Board members that a special meeting is scheduled for May 8<sup>th</sup> prior to the ad hoc meetings of the day to discuss criteria for same pole set.
- Mr. Chow to provide verbiage for the clarification notice on costs for work not performed.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 9:35 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for May 8, 2012.

---

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE**  
**1400 Montefino Ave., Suite 100**  
**Diamond Bar, CA 91765**  
**Phone (909) 348-5920**

**May 8, 2012**

A meeting of the **ad hoc Authorized Cost Elements Committee** took place on the above date, at 9:05 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Mr. Michael Wolf – AT&T California  
Mr. Steve Brown – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Tracey Province – Verizon California  
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility  
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services  
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel  
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network  
Mr. Dennis Ennis – T-Mobile USA  
Mr. Jay Mingus – AT&T California  
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath  
Mr. Al Morales – Time Warner Cable  
Mr. E. Erba – Time Warner Cable  
Mr. Adolph Gonzales – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Doug Schmaderer – City of Pasadena  
Mr. Alvin Aska – City of Anaheim  
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Steve Valdez – Verizon California  
Mr. Tom Fieldse – Verizon California  
Mr. Jim Brown – XO Communications  
Ms. Shawn Henderson – T-Mobile USA (teleconference)  
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff  
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff  
Ms. Jaclyn Lensch – Committee Staff

The meeting commenced at 9:05 a.m. and the **prior month's minutes** were approved with no questions or comments from any members.

The second item on the agenda was the definition of "Set Same Hole." **Mr. Hunter** began the discussion by offering his definition. He explained that a

charge would read “**Set Same Hole**” when a company removed an old pole and, to set new pole, it would need to go some place near the new hole. With the invention of riser brackets, the poles do not need to go in the exact same hole but off set by inches in order to get the brackets to work. Therefore, when a company charges “same hole,” it is if they have to remove the old pole. **Mr. Hunter** opened discussion on his definition and asked for feedback. **Mr. Hunter** briefly responded to what “hard set” means and its differences between “set same hole.” **Ms. Province** mentioned that using terms such as “close proximity” when referring to direction can be ambiguous. **Mr. Wolf** commented on **Mr. Hunter’s** wording of “removing the old pole.” He argued that what was being discussed is two functions: removing the pole and setting it back in the same hole. **Mr. Chow** stated that the reason he brought up the issue at all was because of the frequency of companies doing all the work of facilitating transfer, cables, risers, etc. and then the poles were sometimes not in the same hole.

Further discussion took place concerning the “hard set,” “same hole,” and “cut and kick” terminology. **Mr. Hunter** proposed the idea of joint meetings that would take place between engineers and planners. It was pointed out that this pre-meeting would clarify any misunderstandings before any work is done and therefore, it would be advantageous for all parties involved. **Ms. Gonzales** located the **Pole Set Diagram** that **Mr. Schmaderer** discussed and it was projected for the Committee to see. Mr. Hunter proceeded to go through the entire Pole Set Diagram as various parts were reviewed for accuracy. It was mentioned that “Same Hole” has always meant “Pull Butt”.

**Ms. Pranata**, per Mr. Hunter, changed Item 19 in the Authorized Costs to read, “**cut and kick.**” Item **19C** was altered by Ms. Pranata to read, “not accessible to digging equipment.” **Ms. Hernandez** clarified “**pulling the butt**” is to be billed per Item 19. This is the criteria for “Same Hole.”

The Authorized Cost Elements meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m. The next scheduled meeting is on June 12, 2012.

Jaclyn Lensch – Committee Staff

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE**  
**279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104**  
**San Dimas, CA 91773**  
**Phone (909) 5993801**  
**Fax (909) 599-3825**

**June 12th, 2012**

A meeting of the **ad hoc Authorized Cost Elements Committee** took place on the above date, at 9:05 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Mr. Michael Wolf – AT&T California – (teleconference)  
Ms. Janet Chirrick – AT&T California - (teleconference)  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility  
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services  
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel – (teleconference)  
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network  
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath  
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Shawn Henderson – T-Mobile USA (teleconference)  
Mr. Mike Rivera – Extenet - (teleconference)  
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff  
Ms. Jennie Corella – Committee Staff  
Mr. Kyle Levy- Committee Staff  
Ms. Jenny Silva – Committee Staff

The meeting commenced at 9:05 a.m. and the **prior month's minutes** were reviewed with no questions or comments from any members.

Mr. Hunter inquired if there were any **miscellaneous items**. He then began a discussion by stating he needed some input on a few JPA's that were submitted to him incorrectly. The errors on these JPA's were nonsensical. The time spent researching and correcting these mistakes can be pretty extensive and he feels members should be compensated for this time. Ms. Hernandez agreed this is an issue. She then stated there should be no form 7 submitted on corrections made to a JPA at the approval stage. Mr. Hunter's response was this is being done, however they're being returned with the JPA's attached, but none of the requested corrections are documented on the JPA. In some cases it's a final 18.1. Mr. Chow asked the board what their feelings were on creating an authorized cost? After some discussion, Ms. Hernandez suggested the

member complete the correction of records and bill the utility for their time. Not only will they be billed for issuing the final but also for time spent researching. Mr. Chow then stated he felt the cost should be actual cost to the member as it will vary depending on the member. Another option would be to standardize the amount of time spent correcting the JPA and/or correction of records. **IE:** 3 hours. Each member would bill their cost. Some discussion followed. At this point Ms. Pranata asked if the committee would like an item # for this topic. Mr. Hunter declined stating for now he would go back to his office and discuss options with his people. For the time being he's going to push any incorrect paperwork back until it's corrected.

Mr. Hunter then informed us he would be on vacation beginning June 16<sup>th</sup> and then has surgery scheduled for August 6<sup>th</sup>, 2012. He will not attend the July and August meetings. Therefore, he is requesting a copy of the Authorized Cost for review. He would like to submit his requests for changes/additions as soon as possible.

**Review of Action Items:**

- Ms. Pranata will get the Authorized Cost matrix, pole prices and definitions out to the committee for review before our next meeting.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 9:41 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2012.

Jenny Silva – Committee Staff

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE**  
**279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104**  
**San Dimas, CA 91773**  
**Phone (909) 5993801**  
**Fax (909) 599-3825**

**July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

A meeting of the **ad hoc Authorized Cost Elements Committee** took place on the above date, at 9:05 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Mr. David A. Cheney – AT&T California - (teleconference)  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Tracey Province - Verizon California (teleconference)  
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility  
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Adolph Gonzales – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services  
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel – (teleconference)  
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network  
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/NewPath  
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Shawn Henderson – T-Mobile USA (teleconference)  
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff  
Mr. Kyle Levy- Committee Staff  
Ms. Jenny Silva – Committee Staff

The meeting commenced at 9:05 a.m. and the **prior month's minutes** were reviewed with no questions or comments from any members.

Mr. Hunter began the discussion of the Cost Matrix. Ms. Hernandez suggested the Power Company and Communications review their costs and provide dollar amounts at the next meeting for review. This is the way it had been done in the past. The other option would be to go over the Matrix item by item together. The committee agreed with Lupe's suggestion. Mr. Hunter began a discussion that he felt was left unresolved from last year on section 19 and also PTD's. Ms. Hernandez informed him she believed they resolved the issue under item 1552. The title was changed from Pole set in same hole to Cut and Kick. Mr. Hunter then inquired about the cost of Lowering. Some discussion followed. Mr. Chow expressed that costs should be based on footage since it varies anywhere from 3-25 feet. As of now there is no lowering cost for LTD (Lowering, Transport and Disposal). After much discussion Mr. Hunter

suggested we leave it as is for now since there are costs for transport and disposal. The committee agreed there was no sense in complicating the current method. Ms. Hernandez pointed out there may be a lowering cost included in Section 19A, but the committee would need definitions for clarification. Ms. Hernandez wanted to clarify that Section 19 does not include the price of buying the new pole. Authorized Costs section 19 only covers expenses above and beyond the cost of the new pole.

Ms. Hernandez asked Mr. Hunter to provide criteria for section 19; we need to know what is and should be included in that section. The committee will need a perfect scenario and a horrible one so they could find an average cost. Mr. Hunter asked if someone else would be willing to do this since he would not be able to attend the next two meetings. Mr. Hunter asked that Communications (VZ &H) provide an estimate of what they feel the lowering costs should be. Once the committee has this information, they'll have a better idea on the definition of section 19. Ms. Hernandez noted that she believes they'll find they don't need the PB and they can add the lowering. Mr. Hunter asked the committee what they felt the deadline should be for all of this. Mr. Chow suggested September or October the latest. The committee will have to finalize it by November since they do not meet in December. Mr. Chow then reminded the committee that they still have to review the pole price matrix.

Mr. Chow had one last comment on weighted averages. Currently we are using the Class 3 pole to determine the averages but we're seeing a lot more Class 1 poles in the field. It's highly unlikely that the Class 3 pole is the average pole. Mr. Chow suggested we change the average from 3 to 2. Mr. Hunter noted this would have to be discussed at the next board meeting.

Mr. Hunter then opened up the floor to any miscellaneous items. The committee had none.

**Review of Action Items:**

- Ms. Pranata will send the pole matrix out to the committee before our next meeting.
- Power Company- Provide Equipment costs for cut and kick.
- Communications Company – Provide cost for lowering resulting from a cut and kick.
- Committee to submit pole prices before September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2012.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 9:40 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for August 14<sup>th</sup>, 2012.

Jenny Silva – Committee Staff

## **SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE**

**279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104**

**San Dimas, CA 91773**

**Phone (909) 5993801**

**Fax (909) 599-3825**

**August 14th, 2012**

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

Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Mr. Steve Brown- City of Los Angeles - DWP  
Ms. Tracey Province - Verizon California  
Ms. Janet Chirrick- AT&T California  
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility  
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services  
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel – (teleconference)  
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network  
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/New Path  
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff  
Mr. Kyle Levy- Committee Staff  
Ms. Jenny Silva – Committee Staff

The meeting commenced at 1:00 p.m. and the **prior month's minutes** were reviewed with no questions or comments from any members.

Mr. Hunter began the discussion with Item 2:- Review of criteria for item 19. Mr. Hunter was to provide the criteria for item 19 for review, but he did not have a chance to do so, he will try to have the criteria ready for the next meeting. Ms. Hernandez pointed out that the committee's main reason for requesting the criteria was to verify whether or not pulling the butt and lowering were included in item 19. Mr. Chow then notified the committee that he requested a quote from his evaluations department on the additional costs for cut and kick but he hadn't heard back from them, he'll be sure to follow up before the next meeting.

The committee then moved on to Item 3: the review of the definitions for lowering after a cut and kick. As it stands now there is currently a wash between pulling the butt and lowering (the L is offset by the PB), but both Mr. Hunter and Mr. Chow agree that this is not a fair wash. Mr. Chow then stated that lowering is an incremental cost and there should be a separate cost for it.

Ms. Hernandez then stated that she believed the lowering cost was already covered under item 19. Mr. Hunter suggested we revisit this subject once we have the criteria and definitions for item 19.

Ms. Province then asked for some clarification on item 9- Hand Dig Pole Set. Ms. Pranata then explained that although there are 3 separate scenarios for item 9, (9A, 9B and 9C) there is only one cost. Some discussion followed. Ms. Pranata then suggested it may be a good idea to remove the A, B and C from the matrix to prevent the members from providing three separate costs, Ms Hernandez and Mr. Chow agreed. The committee then discussed item 11 which directed them to Section 8 in the routine handbook. Some discussion followed. Mr. Chow suggested the word “will” be changed to “may” in the first sentence of Section 8.1 and the committee agreed. Ms. Hernandez then asked the committee if they had any new items they wanted to add to the matrix. Mr. Brown suggested a cost be added for Pole Loading calculations. After a lengthy discussion, it was decided at this time not to add an authorized cost for pole loading.

Item 4: Authorized Cost Matrix- Angela will be sending out the Authorized cost Matrix as approved by the committee, minus item 19 and she'll be sure to include a note stating we're waiting on definitions. The due date for the Authorized Cost Matrix is September 30<sup>th</sup>.

Pole Prices are also due on September 30<sup>th</sup>. As of now the City of Lompoc is the only member that has turned in their pole price matrix.

Item 5: Review of the Pole Prices will be left as a standing item until we receive everyone's prices.

Item 6: Engineered Steel Structure Pricing Methodology- Mr. Chow began the discussion stating there has to be a method put in place because he currently has a member saying they will only pay wood prices for these poles. Mr. Hunter stated that at the very least the member should be paying the lightweight steel price for the Engineered Pole. Ms. Province asked how the cost is currently estimated for this. Mr. Chow informed her of what has been done in the past; first they calculate the cost of the foundation then the purchase of the pole and finally the transfer of the pole. On average the cost is \$200,000 per pole. Ms. Province stated that Verizon currently has a no steel policy and she didn't feel the joint owner should have to pay for a steel pole if they didn't benefit from it and that should work both ways, if they joint owner needs the steel pole but power doesn't then they shouldn't have to pay. Mr. Chow then stated that if there is no choice in the matter and they have to change it from wood to steel then it will have to be a shared cost. Ms. Province agreed.

Ms. Province then asked for a more detailed explanation of an engineered pole. Mr. Chow explained that an engineered pole is designed specifically for what it will house, there's a concrete foundation enforced with rebar that the pole sits on and concrete is poured around it. If a wood pole is replaced with an engineered steel pole, they engineer that pole for all the attachments currently on the wood pole. Ms. Province then asked how they would go about adding something after the fact; would they just be out of luck? Mr. Hunter's response was yes you would be out of luck unless you give them weight and standing for

maximum conductors, this would allow you to add on later, but keep in mind there's an additional cost for this. The other option would be to re-engineer the pole and the cost for that is anywhere between \$5,000 and \$6,000. Mr. Chow then stated all electric companies are making decisions as economically as possible.

Mr. Hunter then opened the floor to any miscellaneous items. Ms. Pearson brought up item 14 costs. After some discussion the committee decided to add 14 B to the Authorized Cost Matrix. Angela will add the revised item 14 to the Matrix as follows: 14A- Will now include correction of records. 14B will read as follows: Failure to final JPA Administrative Fee (per pole cost) – Field verification only. Mr. Hunter then asked Mr. Chow to come up with an average cost to field 1 pole. He proposed 2 hours of labor. Mr. Chow agreed to do so and will present the estimate at next month's meeting. Ms. Hernandez suggested 14-A and 14-B be two separate costs since they will not always be used together, for instance there should never be a 14-B on a correction of records, the committee agreed.

Mr. Chow then began a discussion on Pole Replacements per OIR Regulations. As of now poles have to be replaced at 2.67 safety factor, but Mr. Chow feels we should look into raising that number to 2.9 to ensure we stay in compliance. After some discussion, both Ms. Province and Ms. Chirrick agreed to take this information back to their company for further research. Mr. Chow explained if they wanted to come up with a number other than 2.9 he would be open to that as well.

**Review of Action Items:**

- Ms. Pranata will send out the authorized cost matrix minus item 19 and item 14B added.
- Power Company- Provide the definitions and criteria for item 19.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 2:35 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2012.

Jenny Silva – Committee Staff

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE**

**279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104**

**San Dimas, CA 91773**

**Phone (909) 5993801**

**Fax (909) 599-3825**

**September 11th, 2012**

A meeting of the **ad hoc Authorized Cost Elements Committee** took place on the above date, at 12:50 p.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Steve Brown- City of Los Angeles - DWP  
Ms. Janet Chirrick- AT&T California  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility  
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility  
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services  
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel – (teleconference)  
Ms. Debbie Wooten – NextG Network  
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/New Path  
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff  
Mr. Kyle Levy- Committee Staff  
Ms. Jenny Silva – Committee Staff

The meeting commenced at 12:50 p.m. and the **prior month's minutes** were reviewed with no questions or comments from any members.

Mr. Brown began the discussion with Agenda item 2:- Review of criteria for item 19. After much discussion, both Mr. Brown and Mr. Chow agreed on the criteria for item 19, as it stands lowering and pulling the butt are a wash but pulling the butt is much more labor intensive so it was agreed that the cost for item 19 should include time for the clearance of the top portion, moving the top portion of the pole over, supporting the old portion and pulling the butt. There will not be a separate charge for PB turned in. Ms. Hernandez then stated this would have to be discussed and agreed upon at tomorrow's meeting and everyone agreed. Ms. Pranata then asked the committee if they wanted her to go ahead and send the criteria for item 19 to the members, Mr. Chow asked her to hold off until after tomorrow's meeting so we know exactly what verbiage we want to use.

Mr. Brown then moved on to Agenda item 3: Authorized Costs- As of today the only members that have turned their pricing in are LADWP, City of

Lompoc and Metro PCS. The Due Date is for the Authorized Cost is still September 30<sup>th</sup> 2012. We will return to this item once everyone has had a chance to turn in their Authorized Cost Pricing. The same will be done for Agenda item 4: Pole Prices.

Agenda item 5: Engineered Steel Structure Pricing Methodology- The committee did discuss this in detail at last month Authorized Cost meeting, but were not able to reach a resolution. Ms. Hernandez asked that Mr. Chow present the criteria that would explain reasons why an Engineered Steel Pole would be used. Mr. Chow explained the total profile on a pole is what determines whether or not an engineered pole is needed. A discussion followed covering various reasons an Engineered Steel Pole would be used. The committee agreed there really is no way to come up with a dollar amount, there will have to be a method put in place for calculating the price. Ms. Hernandez feels this is something that should be addressed next month since Ms. Province is not present at today's meeting, this will give her more time to get a response from her company on the issue. Mr. Chow informed the committee he has a sample of an Engineered Steel Pole transaction that took place between SCE and Verizon, he will try to bring the information with him to next month's board meeting.

Mr. Brown then moved on to Agenda item 6: Item 1552: Cut & kick Handbook Revisions. Ms. Hernandez asked that this item be moved to Routine. They need to update Section 7.4.

Mr. Brown then open the floor to any Miscellaneous items. There were none.

**Review of Action Items:**

- Criteria for item 19 will be discussed at tomorrow's Board Meeting to clarify a method to calculate cost.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2012.

Jenny Silva – Committee Staff

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE**  
**279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104**  
**San Dimas, CA 91773**  
**Phone (909) 5993801**  
**Fax (909) 599-3825**

**October 10th, 2012**

A meeting of the **ad hoc Authorized Cost Elements Committee** took place on the above date, at 10:45 a.m. at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Janet Chirrick- AT&T California  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless – (teleconference)  
Ms. Tracey Province – Verizon California  
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility  
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility  
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services  
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel – (teleconference)  
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network  
Ms. Amy Parker – NextG Network  
Ms. Debbie Wooten – NextG Network  
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/New Path  
Ms. Jennifer Navarro Yhap – Metro PCS (teleconference)  
Ms. Jessica Pearson – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Emir Erba – Time Warner Cable (North)  
Mr. Alfonso Morales – Time Warner Cable (North)  
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff  
Mr. Kyle Levy- Committee Staff  
Ms. Jenny Silva – Committee Staff

The meeting commenced at 10:45 a.m. and the **prior month's minutes** were reviewed with no questions or comments from any members.

Mr. Chow began the discussion with Agenda item 2:- Review of criteria for item 19. Per Admin Board Meeting Minutes 10/12/2012. The 3 different criteria for item 19 are clearing the existing pole top location, moving the top portion of the pole and supporting it and pulling the butt.

Mr. Chow then moved on to Agenda item 3: Authorized Costs- A few members have yet to turn in their Authorized Cost pricing. The committee feels this discussion should be tabled until we have pricing from all members. Ms. Pranata then asked for clarification on Sections 5, 10 and 13. These are all listed as power only, but she has received pricing from communication as well.

Mr. Chow and Ms. Hernandez informed Ms. Pranata that both Power and Communication should provide cost for sections 5, 10 and 13. Ms. Chirrick then asked the committee if a glossary of some kind exists for Authorized Costs. The response was that no such thing exists. Mr. Chow offered to send her a copy of the picture book he refers to.

Agenda item 4: Pole Prices- The committee feels this item should be tabled until we receive pricing from all members. Ms. Pranata informed the committee of the percentage increases for the members that did turn in their pole prices.

Agenda item 5: Engineered Steel Structure Pricing Methodology- Mr. Chow has not had a chance to put pen to paper on this item. The intent here is to come up with a per foot cost based on the three components that make up the total cost of an engineered steel pole. These costs are: Foundation, price of pole and cost to place in field. Mr. Chow will do his best to have this ready for the next meeting. Ms. Hernandez informed Mr. Chow Section 16.1A and B already covers engineered steel. Mr. Chow agreed to look into Section 16 further and noted the committee may just need to add some clarity to that section. The committee asked this subject be added to the discussion calendar for next week's Administrative Board Meeting

Mr. Chow then opened the floor to any miscellaneous items. A discussion on item 12A followed. Mr. Chow made some calls and was able to get a little more information on how Edison handles section 12A. Generally Edison never charges for 12A, this is considered a routine inspection that is usually in compliance with General Order 165. Mr. Chow did add that he only speaks for Edison on this matter; other members may have a completely different interpretation of section 12A. Ms. Hernandez then pointed out the City of Pasadena decided to no longer charge the 12A after listening in on the last discussion so she feels these are good conversations to have.

**Review of Action Items:**

- Mr. Chow to provide pricing on Engineered Steel Poles.
- Mr. Chow to provide Picture book for Janet Chirrick.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 11:18 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for November 13<sup>th</sup>, 2012.

Jenny Silva – Committee Staff

## SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 5993801

Fax (909) 599-3825

November 13th, 2012

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

Mr. Scott Hunter – City of Los Angeles – DWP  
Mr. Steve Brown – City of Los Angeles - DWP  
Ms. Janet Chirrick- AT&T California – (teleconference)  
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless  
Ms. Tracey Province – Verizon California  
Ms. Yvonne Johnson – AT&T Mobility  
Ms. Shawn Henderson – AT&T Mobility  
Mr. Jim Eastwood – Southern California Edison  
Mr. Larry Chow – Southern California Edison  
Ms. Lupe Hernandez – AT&T Local Services  
Ms. Alicia Smith – Sprint/Sprint-Nextel – (teleconference)  
Ms. Paula Haney – NextG Network  
Ms. Maria Ortiz – CA CLEC, LLC/New Path  
Ms. Jennifer Navarro Yhap – Metro PCS (teleconference)  
Mr. Lawrence Yao – City of Riverside – (teleconference)  
Ms. Angela Pranata – Committee Staff  
Mr. Kyle Levy- Committee Staff  
Ms. Jenny Silva – Committee Staff

The meeting commenced at 9:15 a.m. The **prior month's minutes** were reviewed with no questions or comments from any members.

Mr. Hunter began the discussion with Agenda item 2:- Review of Authorized Cost Prices. Mr. Chow asked that this discussion be tabled until he could get his prices turned in. He informed the committee that he would have his prices turned in by Friday.

Mr. Hunter then moved on to Agenda item 3: Review of Pole Prices- Ms. Hernandez pointed out that the price for 45' wood poles had gone up 49%. After some review Ms. Pranata realized the reason for the high percentage was the 2012 prices listed were incorrect. Ms. Pranata then corrected the prices. After much review Mr. Hunter expressed some concern on how to handle the costs for members that did not provide prices on everything for 2013, should the committee use the last price given by that member? After much discussion

the committee decided the best thing to do would be to use the 2012 wood weighted average price for members that did not provide a 2013 price. The committee asked that this topic be added to the Admin Board Agenda for discussion in tomorrow's meeting. Once this topic has been discussed the Board will be able to vote at the January meeting. Mr. Hunter also suggested Ms. Pranata include a copy of Draft 3 Pole Prices in the Admin Board Meeting packet for review.

Agenda Item 4: Engineered Steel Structure Pricing Methodology. Mr. Chow asked that this item be tabled until next meeting. Mr. Hunter agreed.

Agenda Item 5: Removal of Item 12A Visual Only Inspections. Mr. Brown explained to the committee that the only time DWP charges a 12A is when they go out to do an intrusive inspection but for whatever reason they are unable to, reasons may vary from a fence blocking the way to a dog in a yard. From now on in these instances DWP will be sure to list item 12B on the JPA and they will be correcting the JPA's with 12A listed. Mr. Chow then explained that Edison very rarely charges 12A, in fact they've only charged it 10 to 12 times in the last year and those cases were all intrusive inspections. Ms. Chirrick suggested we just do away with item 12A all together. Ms. Prescott pointed out that item 12 in general doesn't make sense now that communication is required to do their own inspections; it just doesn't seem right for communication to have to pay power for a pole inspection that they have to do themselves anyway. Mr. Chow then suggested that each member bill the other party whenever they do an inspection, he realizes how much this doesn't make sense but it's the only way he can think of keeping everything fair. Mr. Brown pointed out the current criteria for item 12 does not allow you to bill for an inspection on the same pole more than once in a five year period. Mr. Chow then suggested the committee consider getting rid of the five year rule until we're all able to come up with a better plan. The ultimate goal here would be to share inspection information, but we're just not there yet. Mr. Hunter asked the committee to focus on item 12A first; both Mr. Hunter and Mr. Chow do not have a problem doing away with item 12A. Mr. Chow pointed out that the issue Ms. Chirrick is having is not with LADWP or Edison but with The Cities of Riverside and Anaheim. If 12A is specific to the city of Riverside's program and their program has been approved then getting rid of item 12A would be a problem. Mr. Hunter then asked Ms. Pranata if she had a copy of Riverside's Maintenance/Inspection program. Ms. Pranata informed him that she did and agreed to email a copy to the Authorized Cost Committee as well as Mr. Yao with the City of Riverside. The committee has decided to further discuss this item at tomorrow's Administrative Board Meeting. They've also decided to change item 1560 so that it reads Discussion of item 12 instead of Removal of item 12A. Item 1560 will also be added to the Routine Revision agenda. Mr. Brown then took a moment to read the inspection requirements for Communication 80.1, Rule 18. Ms. Pranata asked that he email a copy to her so she could include it to tomorrow's Admin Board meeting packet.

Mr. Hunter then opened the floor to any miscellaneous items. Mr. Chow brought up an issue he's having with certain members disputing the cost of transfers. Edison feels if a transfer is done and it will hold permanently then they should be compensated. Ms. Province stated that she can understand having to pay for a transfer where permanent hardware was used, but she against having to pay for a transfer that's roped up. Mr. Chow asked that an item number be assigned to this issue for discussion at our next Authorized Cost meeting. Item 1563: Transfer- Authorized Cost was created and will be added to the January agenda.

Mr. Hunter then informed the committee that he would only be able to attend the back to back meetings if they are scheduled on the third Tuesday and Wednesday of the month. If the meeting will be taking place on the second Tuesday and Thursday of the month he would have to resign due to prior commitments.

**Review of Action Items:**

- Ms. Pranata to add Draft 3/Wood Weighted Average Poles 75' and down to Admin Board meeting packet for discussion.
- Mr. Levy to change the definition of Item 1560 from Removal of 12A – Visual Inspections only to “Discussion of Item 12”.
- Ms. Pranata to email the entire Authorized Cost Committee as well as Mr. Yao with the City of Riverside the Maintenance/Inspection program for both the City of Riverside and Anaheim.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2013.

Jenny Silva – Committee Staff