

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

444 E. Huntington Drive Ste. 205

Arcadia, CA 91006

Phone (626) 294-0821

Fax (626) 2940872

March 20, 2001

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. Dan Lewis – Verizon California
Ms. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Mr. Ernie Solorzano - So. Calif. Edison Co.
Ms. Sherri Goetz - So. Calif. Edison Co.
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Mr. Chris Bengtsson – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Mr. Mike Bogner – Sprint PCS
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Ernie Solorzano opened the meeting with **Item 1300: Pole Set in Same Hole.** Mr. Solorzano reported that he has not received the requested information from his organization on costs for this item. However, he stated that speaking generally within his organization he was told that the approximate additional costs could range between \$700.00 to \$1,000.00. Mr. Bengtsson requested that Mr. Solorzano state case scenarios where a pole would require being set in the same hole. Mr. Solorzano stated that he would like the members to inquire within their organizations what the additional costs for setting a pole in the same hole are and report to him at the next meeting. He stated that with this information the Committee could arrive at a reasonable cost for this item. Ms. Dell inquired if any of the members had a tool at arriving at a fair cost for this item. Mr. Bengtsson explained how his organization arrives at costs. DWP employs a management system, which has a benchmark in place for item costs, thus giving them a starting point. He stated that there are extra costs above and behind the benchmark cost, and these are the differential costs. Mr. Bengtsson stated that this cost is approximately \$700.00. Mr. Solorzano asked the members if anyone had a problem with establishing an Authorized Costs for this item. Ms. Hernandez stated that she had a concern. In her opinion if an Authorized Costs is established for this item, it eliminates the need for a field meet, and the decision to set a pole in the same hole should be agreed upon by all owners. Mr. Bengtsson presented scenarios where setting a pole in the same hole is the only alternative. Mr. Solorzano stated that establishing a cost for this item is not his only objective. He understands that criteria must be established. He stated that a concern of his is the ability to transfer other member equipment when setting a new pole. He further stated that what he is seeing in the field is the old pole next to the new pole with the equipment not being transferred by the responsible party. He stated his primary goal is to ensure that the old poles are removed from the field. Mr. Solorzano stated that upon returning to his organization, he would create general scenarios where this issue would apply, and at the next Authorized Costs meeting this issue would be discussed further.

Item 1301: A/C Item 91/Item 89 (Cable Splicing/Cable Terminal Replacement) was discussed next. Mr. Lewis stated that the costs could be high due to material costs. He also stated that he is aware the costs are usually high, however, there is much involved when transferring cable. Mr. Solorzano stated these costs could not truly reflect the time and effort to splice or replace cable. Mr. Lewis cited a case when the situation justified the costs. Mr. Solorzano stated that of all the Authorized Costs in the Routine, this is the primary one that seems unreasonable. However, Mr. Solorzano stated that upon returning to his organization he would research this issue further, and the members will discuss this issue again at the next Authorized Costs meeting.

The third issue on the agenda was **Item 1303:Ground Line Re-Mediation.** Mr. Solorzano reported that what he would like to accomplish is an Authorized Cost for fiberglass wrap. He stated that current costs are between \$300.00 to \$800.00, and that he would like to arrive at a fair average cost for fiberglass wrap. He reported in regards to volume, SCE plans on using fiberglass and steel stubbing on approximately 150 poles this year. However, the current method at arriving at a cost for this issue is time consuming and that an established cost would prove cost effective. This issue will remain on the agenda for future discussion.

The fourth issue on the agenda was **Item 1308: Methodology for Pole Prices.** This issue deals with the current method being utilized by the Committee to establish yearly pole prices. He stated in regards to SCE, he is of the opinion that they should set their own prices. As an example, Mr. Solorzano cited this years pole prices. It seems that the prices for DWP were considerably lower this year than last. This caused the weighted average to drop substantially lower than what it costs SCE to place a new pole. Since SCE is the major pole setting entity, Mr. Solorzano stated that this method causes SCE a loss. Mr. Bengtsson stated that he questioned the pole costs within his organization, and he was informed that the numbers are correct according to the management system being employed by the City of Los Angeles. Mr. Solorzano remarked that only a small amount of members submit their prices, and that it has been these same members every year who are responsive. A truer reflection of pole prices would be if all members submitted their pole costs. Mr. Solorzano is of the opinion that the current method of setting pole prices, which is based on a weighted average, is not the correct method the Committee should be applying. Item number 1312 has been assigned to Review of 2001 Pole Prices.

Under miscellaneous items the members discussed wind loading and over-loading on poles. Ms. Dell expressed the need of standard criteria for pole loading calculations. The members discussed this issue at length.

The members also discussed the issue of pole tagging. Mr. Solorzano inquired when SCE tags a pole is a preliminary necessary or would merely a final suffice. Ms. Hernandez stated that she would need to research this upon her return to her organization, because her staff

November 1 2000

is trained that a final JPA must have a preliminary in order to be processed. The remaining members stated that they do not think it would be a problem within their organization. Ms. Hernandez stated she would report her findings at the next meeting.

Ms. Dell inquired as to the e-mail request from SCE in regards to antennas and micro-dishes. Mr. Solorzano stated that SCE is attempting to identify those poles with such equipment attached. SCE is in the process of updating their database with this information. Another issue is a safety factor for SCE employees.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m., until April 26, 2001.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

444 E. Huntington Drive Ste. 205

Arcadia, CA 91006

Phone (626) 294-0821

Fax (626) 2940872

April 26, 2001

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 1:45 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Dan Lewis – Verizon California
Ms. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Mr. Ernie Solorzano - So. Calif. Edison Co.
Ms. Sherri Goetz - So. Calif. Edison Co.
Mr. Dennis Ennis – AT&T Wireless
Mr. Chris Bengtsson – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Mr. Doug Schmaderer – City of Pasadena
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Mike Bogner – Sprint PCS
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Ernie Solorzano opened the meeting with **Item 1300: Pole Set in Same Hole.** Mr. Bengtsson reported that his organization has created a power point presentation in regards to a pole being set in the same hole. It will present the difference in costs between the DWP management system and the Joint Pole Committee. He stated that he would present it to the Committee via visual presentation, or distribute a hard copy to the members at the following meeting.

Item 1301: A/C Item 91/Item 89 (Cable Splicing/Cable Terminal Replacement) was discussed next. Mr. Solorzano stated that the members should have received via e-mail a copy of the proposed costs for the above mentioned items. Mr. Solorzano asked the members if the proposed prices reflected a fair Authorized Cost for Item's 89 and 91. The members agreed that the costs appeared reasonable. He stated that this issue would be on the Discussion Calendar at the next Administrative Board meeting.

The third issue on the agenda was **Item 1303:Ground Line Re-Mediation.** Mr. Solorzano stated that he would like to establish a standard cost for fiberglass wrap of a pole. He researched costs within his organization, and arrived at an approximate standard cost of \$650.00, \$770.00 in concrete, and \$900.00 in asphalt. Mr. Solorzano stated that he would e-mail the members with these numbers and how he arrived at these costs.

November 1 2000

The fourth issue on the agenda was **Item 1308: Methodology for Pole Prices.** Mr. Solorzano asked the members if they had given any consideration to implementing respective pole price schedules for each individual member. Mr. Lewis stated that he is of the opinion that the Committee is moving in that direction with 25 pole price schedules for 25 members. This issue will be discussed further at the next Authorized Costs meeting.

Lastly, under miscellaneous items, Mr. Solorzano reported on the issue of the clearance of brush from structures in state restricted areas. SCE is in the process of identifying those structures in SR areas, and whether they are jointly owned. Mr. Solorzano will notify those members that are identified as joint owners on such poles, and will discuss this further at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m., until May 17, 2001.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

444 E. Huntington Drive Ste. 205

Arcadia, CA 91006

Phone (626) 294-0821

Fax (626) 2940872

May 17, 2001

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:

Mr. Dan Lewis – Verizon California
Ms. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Mr. Ernie Solorzano - So. Calif. Edison Co.
Ms. Sherri Goetz - So. Calif. Edison Co.
Mr. Glenn Albios – Adelfia Business Solutions
Mr. Chris Bengtsson – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Mr. Doug Schmaderer – City of Pasadena
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Mike Bogner – Sprint PCS
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Guest:

Mr. Dennis Walls - City of Los Angeles (DWP)

Chairman, Ernie Solorzano opened the meeting with **Item 1300: Pole Set in Same Hole.** Ms. Hernandez stated that according to the last meeting, it had been agreed that if a cost were set for this issue, this would result in eliminating field meets. She stated that the decision to set a pole in the same hole should be agreed upon by the joint members prior to setting the pole. If an Authorized Cost were set, the other members would not have the opportunity to agree/disagree on using this method as opposed to another. Mr. Bengtsson stated that setting a pole in the same hole is work intensive and costly. Therefore, normally the method is used in cases where there is no other recourse. As he has before, Mr. Bengtsson stated that there are too many variables that must be taken into account when deciding to set a pole in the same hole. The members discussed this issue at length, and it was decided to leave this item open at this time.

The next issue discussed was **Item 1303:Ground Line Re-Mediation.** Mr. Solorzano stated the proposed costs for fiberglass wrap, which are as follows: set in dirt=\$770.00, set in asphalt=\$910.00, and set in concrete=\$1015.00. It was decided that this item would be on the discussion calendar of the June Administrative Board meeting.

The fourth issue on the agenda was **Item 1308: Methodology for Pole Prices.** Mr. Solorzano stated that this issue addresses the current method used by the Committee to arrive at pole prices. In his opinion, the current weighted average method does not appear to be equitable,

May 17, 2001

and there is the possibility that SCE would submit individual pole prices. Ms. Dell stated that the current method should prove equitable to SCE in that they are the major pole-setting entity, and carry the greatest weight. Mr. Solorzano stated that this method should be reviewed and improved upon. The members discussed this issue, and it was decided that it remain on the agenda.

Next was a presentation by Mr. Dennis Walls of DWP, demonstrating the costs of replacing a pole, which DWP has created for their planners. The members questioned, and discussed the costs with Mr. Walls. They then thanked Mr. Walls for an informational presentation.

Item 1314: Antenna/Microcell Identification was discussed next. Mr. Solorzano stated that this issue deals with identifying this equipment on the pole card. This issue will remain on the agenda.

Lastly, a meeting was scheduled to review Authorized Costs for 2002. Item number 1316 was assigned to this issue.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m., until June 26, 2001.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

444 E. Huntington Drive Ste. 205

Arcadia, CA 91006

Phone (626) 294-0821

Fax (626) 2940872

June 26, 2001

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:

Mr. Dan Lewis – Verizon California
Ms. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Mr. Ernie Solorzano - So. Calif. Edison Co.
Ms. Sherri Goetz - So. Calif. Edison Co.
Mr. Chris Bengtsson – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Mr. Malcolm Brown - Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Ernie Solorzano opened the meeting with **Item 1300: Methodology for Pole Prices.** Mr. Solorzano distributed the work sheet utilized by SCE to arrive at pole prices. He proceeded to explain to the members the method utilized by SCE to calculate an average pole price considering the various pole classes. Mr. Solorzano stated that historically, only a small percentage of the membership submits pole prices annually. The issues of having each member submit their individual pole prices, and Authorized Costs having 25 pole price costs was discussed. Mr. Solorzano inquired about those members that neglect to submit prices. Ms. Hernandez responded stating that perhaps those members that do not submit costs will default to the lowest power or communications cost. Ms. Prescott suggested taking the average costs of prices submitted to arrive at a default cost. Mr. Brown remarked that by using the costs directly associated with the costs of each member would be a move toward realistic pole prices. The final consensus was to discuss the issue of the single average cost for poles applicable to all members, currently being utilized, versus 25 individual costs related to each member at the July Administrative Board meeting. This item will on the Discussion Calendar of the July Board meeting.

The next issue discussed was **Item 1300: Pole Set in Same Hole.** Mr. Solorzano reported that he requested from the managers within his organization the additional costs of setting a pole in the same hole. He stated that they reported approximately an additional \$1,000.00. Mr. Solorzano stated that in his opinion, perhaps a standardized cost should be set for this transaction. Ms. Hernandez stated that she could not support setting an Authorized Cost for this situation, because every case is unique and should be addressed via a field meet. If a Cost is set, this would eliminate the need for a field meet, and in her opinion all owners should have the opportunity to arrive at a business decision as to whether or not this method should be used as opposed to a less costly pole replacement method. Mr. Lewis agreed with Ms.

June 26, 2001

Hernandez, and in his opinion setting an Authorized Costs would eliminate the need for a field meet, and joint owners should be in agreement when deciding to use this method, therefore, he could not support an Authorized Cost. Mr. Bengtsson stated that he also agreed with Ms. Hernandez, because the cut and kick method is labor intensive as well as costly, and all owners should be in agreement. He also stated that each member should make the effort to contact the other joint owners and arrange a field meet to come to an agreement. The members discussed this issue at length, and it was decided that this issue remains open at this time.

The final issue on the agenda was **Item 1316: Review of 2002 Authorized Costs.** This is in regards to the procedure of every two years reviewing Authorized Costs to ascertain that the current costs reflect a realistic and reasonable cost to current market. It was decided that the power members would arrange a meeting to discuss/review Authorized Costs prior to the next Authorized Costs Meeting. The communications and wireless members would do the same.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m., until July 19, 2001.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

444 E. Huntington Drive Ste. 205

Arcadia, CA 91006

Phone (626) 294-0821

Fax (626) 2940872

August 16, 2001

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 2:15 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Dan Lewis – Verizon California
Ms. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Mr. Ernie Solorzano - So. Calif. Edison Co.
Ms. Sherri Goetz - So. Calif. Edison Co.
Mr. Chris Bengtsson – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Mr. Mike Bogner – Sprint PCS
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Lynn George – AT&T Wireless
Mr. Doug Schmaderer – City of Pasadena
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Ernie Solorzano opened the meeting with the first issue on the agenda, which was **Item 1300: Pole Set in Same Hole.** Mr. Solorzano stated that this issue had been discussed at Routine Revision, and would not be addressed at this meeting, however, it would remain open on the agenda for further discussion.

The next issue on the agenda was **Item 1308: Methodology for Pole Prices.** This issue addresses the current weighted average method used to determine annual pole prices. Ms. Dell stated that it has not been decided whether the current method would be changed. Ms. Hernandez stated that a decision would not be made until the 2002 proposed prices are calculated. Mr. Solorzano urged everyone to work on his or her pole prices and submit them. Mr. Lewis advised everyone to consider all costs and expense when determining pole costs. It was decided that the pole matrix worksheet would be sent to the members, adding a column for pole class. When Ms. Corella has received the pole matrix worksheets from the members it would be discussed how Ms. Corella would work the data in order to arrive at a fair cost. Ms. Lewis stated that if it appears that the weighted average pole costs do not appear to be beneficial to all members, than the possibility of every member having their individual pole costs would be considered. This item would remain on the agenda for further discussion.

The final issue on the agenda was **Item 1316: Review of 2002 Authorized Costs.** Mr. Solorzano reported that SCE had met with the City of Los Angeles, and the City of Pasadena for review of the Authorized Costs that have an impact on the electric utilities. They reviewed items

August 16, 2001

4 through 10, 115 and 116 for accuracy. Mr. Lewis stated that the telecommunications had discussed Authorized Costs pertaining to their organizations for accuracy as well. The members will return to the next meeting with any concerns or suggestions for change to any Authorized Costs items.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m., until September 19, 2001.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

444 E. Huntington Drive Ste. 205

Arcadia, CA 91006

Phone (626) 294-0821

Fax (626) 2940872

October 17, 2001

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 9:15 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Mr. Ernie Solorzano - So. Calif. Edison Co.
Mr. Chris Bengtsson – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Mr. Mike Bogner – Sprint PCS
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Lynn George – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Ernie Solorzano opened the meeting by reporting that he, Mr. Bengtsson and Mr. Cox had met to review the current Authorized Costs to ensure that they reflected the costs of doing business today. He then reported on the results of that meeting, which addressed the third item on the agenda, **Item 1316: Review of 2002 Authorized Costs**.

The first cost discussed was **A/C number 4-Straightening in Earth**. Mr. Solorzano stated the SCE criteria for straightening a pole that is out of line is one foot for every ten feet. Mr. Bengtsson stated criteria for DWP is when a riser or a rebuild is required or prompted by a customer complaint. Mr. Solorzano stated that A/C numbers 115, and 116 are tied to A/C number four, and clarified that on certain occasions, straightening of poles would result in two costs.

The next item discussed was **A/C 5 – C, Topping of pole**. The current cost is \$149.00. The electric utilities discussed the situations requiring multiple cuts. The electric utilities proposed \$149.00 for the initial cut and an additional \$75.00 for any additional cuts. Ms. Dell inquired as to what costs were considered when setting the \$149.00 cost, and that perhaps the multiple costs were imbedded in the current costs. Ms. Hernandez stated the problem of monitoring the number of cuts required for topping a pole. She suggested setting a limit of three cuts per pole since this number appears to be the maximum cuts required, and raising the cost on pole topping to cover three cuts. The members discussed this issue at length, and agreed to increase the cost of A/C item 5-C from \$149.00 to \$225.00.

A/C Item 6 – Pole Stubbing was discussed next. Mr. Solorzano stated that the electric utilities would review these costs per pole to ensure accuracy. Mr. Bengtsson stated that the stubbing costs for DWP are based on stub size not pole size. The A/C in the Routine Handbook are based on pole size not stub size. The members discussed costs based on a 45-foot pole. The members proposed to base costs on stub size and not pole size. The proposed costs are as follows: 6(A) 10' = \$380.00, 6(B) 11' = \$520.00, 6(C) 12' = \$550.00, and 6(D) Add'l Truss (all sizes) = \$140.00.

The next item addressed was **A/C number 7 = Semi-circular cable guard (“U” guard)**. This cost pertains to the telecommunications utilities. Therefore, Ms. Hernandez stated that she would review and research these costs to ensure accuracy and report back to the Committee.

A/C Item 8 – Semi-Circular pole guards was discussed next. Mr. Solorzano reported that the electric utilities had arrived at a proposed cost for item 8 (A) of \$116.00 which is a \$10.00 increase from the current cost of \$106.00, and Item 8 (B) with a current cost of \$65.00 and a proposed increase of \$ 32.00 to \$97.00.

The next item for discussion was **A/C Item 10 = Sidewalk or pavement repairs for placement, replacement, or removal of pole or anchor**. The proposals for this item were primarily additional verbiage. The proposed changes are as follows: 10(A) = Cement break and repair \$240.00, 10(B) = Asphalt break and repair \$88.00, 10(C) = Cement sawcut break and repair \$503.00. There was a brief discussion of a value for temporary repair, which had been suggested by Mr. Cox at the electric utilities meeting, however, since he was not in attendance this item would not be proposed at this time.

A/C Items 115 and 116 were next for discussion. It was agreed that there would be no changes at this time.

The next issue addressed was **A/C Item 16 = Backhoe**. Mr. Solorzano stated that his organization had received a bill for backhoe of \$116.66 per hour, which is not in accordance with the Handbook which reflects a cost of \$59.00 per hour. It was agreed that this item requires some review of costs. The members will discuss this issue further at the next meeting.

Mr. Solorzano opened a discussion of **mod poles**. He stated that the Handbook lacks a It was agreed that this item requires reviewing of costs. cost for mod poles. Ms. Hernandez stated that in her opinion, mod poles have always been handled via special agreement. Mr. Solorzano inquired if the members would be opposed to establishing a cost for mod poles. It was decided to assign A/C Item 18 to Mod Pole Material and Installation, and the proposed costs are as follows: 18(A) 9’ = \$1,290.00, 18(B) 14’ = \$1,409.00, 18(C) 18’ = \$1,530.00.

Mr. Brown and Ms. Dell opened the discussion on **A/C Item 96 and Item 171** in regards to translators. The members discussed these items at length and agreed the costs were adequate.

It was determined that all other Authorized Costs would not require change.

The next item on the agenda for discussion was **Item 1300: Pole Set in the Same Hole**. Mr. Bengtsson reported that in the past DWP’s stand on this issue was that every case should be addressed individually, however, the Department would now consider a set established cost for a pole set in the same hole. Mr. Solorzano remarked that within his organization they are of the opinion that a set cost should be established for his situation. Ms. Hernandez stated that although she is not opposed to setting an established cost for pole set in the same hole, her concern is that this could eliminate the need of a field meet. She stated that she continues to receive JPAs with the Form 48 attached. Mr. Solorzano remarked that at previous meetings he had suggested a cost of \$750.00-\$800.00. Mr. Bengtsson stated that he would recommend a set of costs based on the level of labor intensity. He stated that he would arrive at costs and share them with the members by the next meeting. The members agreed to discuss this item further at the next meeting.

October 17, 2001

The next issue on the agenda was **Item 1308: Methodology for Pole Prices.** It was decided to put this item on the discussion calendar for the October 18, 2001 Administrative Board Meeting.

The final issue for discussion was **Item 1317: 2002 Pole Prices.** Ms. Corella reported that she had received a small percentage of pole prices from members. Ms. Hernandez stated that members who do not submit pole prices are in violation of the Agreement according to Section 6(B-7). The members discussed this issue and agreed that members have three options in regards to pole prices. The options are as follows: 1) those members who submit prices may choose to use their prices, 2) be included in the weighted average method and use the weighted average price, or 3) choose not to submit prices and default to the lowest prices submitted. Ms. Corella was instructed to send the members a second request for pole prices, and notifying them of the above mentioned options.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m., until November 2001.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

444 E. Huntington Drive Ste. 205

Arcadia, CA 91006

Phone (626) 294-0821

Fax (626) 2940872

November 1, 2001

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. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Mr. Ernie Solorzano - So. Calif. Edison Co.
Mr. Chris Bengtsson – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Mr. Dan Lewis – Verizon California
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Sherri Goetz – So. Calif. Edison Co.
Mr. J. Craig Wayment – City of Glendale
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Ernie Solorzano commenced the meeting at 9:15 am and stated that the primary issue addressed at the meeting would be the proposed 2002 pole prices and the current pole price methodology being used by the Committee.

The first issue up for discussion was **Item 1300: Pole Set in Same Hole**. Mr. Solorzano reported that once 2002 pole prices were established the Committee then would concentrate on this issue. This item is to remain open at this time.

The next topic on the agenda was **Item 1308: Methodology for Pole Prices**. Mr. Solorzano stated that this item has been resolved (please refer to the October 17, 2001 Authorized Costs Meeting for details). At the prior Authorized Costs meeting the members had agreed on a methodology which will be on the November 15, 2001 Administrative Board Meeting for discussion. However, Mr. Solorzano stated that he would not agree to allow his prices used in arriving at the weighted average pole prices because SCE has opted to use their actual costs for pole prices. The members will discuss this item further at the next Board meeting.

The next item discussed was **Item 1319: 2002 Pole Prices**. The members reviewed and discussed at length the spreadsheets created by the pole costs submitted by the members. This item will be on the November 15, 2001 Discussion Calendar.

Mr. Solorzano reported that his organization has planned for the incoming year an intensive pole inspection program. He proposed a meeting focused on pole inspections to ensure that poles were inspected uniformly.

Item 1316: Review of 2002 Authorized Costs was next on the agenda. Mr. Solorzano stated that, aside from the proposed costs brought about from the last meeting, what were the intentions of the Committee in regards to the remaining Authorized Costs. Mr. Lewis responded that Authorized Costs are thoroughly reviewed and adjusted every other year. To his

October 17, 2001

recollection, Mr. Lewis stated that the Costs had been adjusted the previous year, therefore, the costs could remain as such for the next year. The members agreed to no change at this time until the review of the Costs for the year 2003.

Ms. Hernandez submitted proposed costs for **A/C Item #7** – Semi-circular cable guard (“U” guard) = (a) installation =45.00/ (b) transferring = 50.00, and **A/C Item #16** – Backhoe = (a) 2 hour minimum = 150.00/(b) each additional hour (inclusive operator and truck) = 75.00. These proposals will be added to the list of 2002 proposed costs for further discussion.

Under miscellaneous items Mr. Solorzano assigned new **Item 1320: Vegetation Management/Fire Prevention**. It was agreed that a new Routine Revision section would be created. Section 19.8 will be used to address the issue of controlling vegetation surrounding a structure for the safety of the public. This item is assigned to both Authorized Costs and Routine Revision.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m., until December 2001.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

444 E. Huntington Drive Ste. 205

Arcadia, CA 91006

Phone (626) 294-0821

Fax (626) 2940872

December 5, 2001

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. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Mr. Ernie Solorzano - So. Calif. Edison Co.
Mr. Chris Bengtsson – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Mr. Dan Lewis – Verizon California
Mr. Doug Schmaderer – City of Pasadena
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Sherri Goetz – So. Calif. Edison Co.
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Ms. Lynn George - AT&T Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Ernie Solorzano commenced the meeting at 9:10 am and stated that once again the primary topic of discussion would be **Item 1319: 2002 Pole Prices**. Ms. Hernandez opened the discussion by stating that after reviewing the proposed pole price spreadsheets she became aware that the prices submitted by the City of Glendale were high in her opinion. It was suggested that perhaps some of the members do not fully understand the concept of arriving at pole prices. Mr. Lewis stated that the current matrix the members are using to calculate pole prices should be revisited and reviewed. The criteria and definition of elements should be reviewed to ensure that they are current with the standard of today. Mr. Solorzano stated that every component of setting a pole, from start to clean up, should be taken into account when creating the criteria for pole prices. The members then worked the spreadsheets to arrive at fair and equitable prices. It was agreed that the Committee would discuss and create new criteria and a definition of elements at the next meeting in preparation for 2003. **Item 1321: 2003 Pole Price Structure/Criteria** has been assigned to Authorized Costs in order to arrive at a reasonable and equitable method of creating pole costs. Since Southern California Edison and the City of Pasadena opted to have their individual pole prices used in 2003, the remaining utilities that had submitted pole costs, within the deadline, would then be included in the weighted average costs for the year 2002.

Item 1316: Review of 2002 Authorized Costs was discussed next. The members reviewed the sheet reflecting the current and proposed costs (see attached). After a few minor changes to the sheet, the members agreed that the proposed cost changes would be on the Consent Calendar of the next Board meeting.

The next issue up for discussion was **Item 1300: Pole Set in Same Hole**. Mr. Solorzano inquired if any of the present members would oppose a set cost for a pole set in the same hole. Ms. Hernandez responded that she is not opposed, however, she continues to receive JPAs with

December 5, 2001

Form 48's attached. In her opinion, this is getting away from the field meet. Mr. Bengtsson stated that according to his experience within his organization, field meets are difficult to coordinate. Aside from this difficulty, the people meeting in the field require the experience and skill to arrive at an intelligent and equitable agreement among one another. After extensive discussion the members agreed that this item would remain on the agenda for further review.

Item 1320: Vegetation Management/Fire Prevention was the last topic on the agenda. This issue concerns poles that are in state restricted areas (SRA), and the management of the surrounding brush. Verbiage and costs must be discussed and implemented into the Routine. The Committee will discuss this issue at length at future meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m., until 2002.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

Authorized Costs Committee 2002 Proposals

Current	Proposed
A/C Item 5 (C) Topping Pole.....149	A/C Item 5 (C) Topping Pole..... 225 *based on 2 cuts, topping and lowering.
A/C Item 6 Pole Stubbing (pole height): 30' 35' 40' 45' 50' 55' 60' 263 286 286 307 329 390 506	A/C Item 6 Pole Stubbing (stub-size): (a) 8 ft. plates.....380 (b) 10 ft. plates.....520 (c) 12 ft. plates.....550 (d) additional trusses (all sizes).....140 * additional costs for rear property is inclusive.
A/C Item 8 Semi-circular pole guards: (a) Installation.....106 (b) Transferring..... 65	A/C Item 8 Semi-circular pole guards: (a) Installation..... 116 (b) Transferring..... 97
A/C Item 10 Sidewalk or pavement repairs for placement, replacement, or removal of pole or anchor: (a) Cement.....240 (b) Asphalt..... 88 (c) Break and Repair (Saw Cut).....263	A/C Item 10 Sidewalk or pavement repairs for placement, replacement, or removal of pole anchor: (a) Cement break and repair240 (b) Asphalt break and repair 88 (c) Cement saw cut break and repair..... 503
None	A/C Item 18 Mod pole material and installation (a) 9'.....1290 (b) 14'.....1409 (c) 18'.....1530
A/C Item 7 Semi-circular cable guard ("U" guard) (a) installation.....55 (b) transferring.....33	A/C Item 7 Semi-circular cable guard ("U" guard) (a) installation..... 45 (b) transferring..... 50

<p>A/C Item 16 Backhoe: (per hour).....59</p>	<p>A/C Item 16 Backhoe: (a) 2 hour minimum.....150 (b) Each additional hour (inclusive operator & truck).....75</p>
<p>A/C Item 96 Transfer Translator.....4674</p>	<p>A/C Item 96 Transfer Translator5800</p>

**** all other Authorized Costs items will remain at current 2001 prices for 2002, until review for January 2003.**