

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

444 E. Huntington Drive Ste. 205

Arcadia, CA 91006

Phone (626) 294-0821

Fax (626) 294-0872

January 15, 2002

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
Mr. Sheldon Cox – City of Pasadena
Mr. Dennis Ennis – AT&T Wireless
Mr. Mike Bogner – Sprint PCS
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Ernie Solorzano opened the meeting at 9:10 am. He stated that **Item 1319: 2002 Pole Prices, and Item 1321: 2002 Pole Price Structure/Criteria** were related and would be the first issues discussed. He further stated that the purpose of Item 1321 is to modify the current method being used by members to arrive at their individual pole prices to reflect a value that is inclusive of all variables entailed in pole pricing, and prove equitable to those members involved in the process. He further stated that as one of the primary pole setters, he is of the opinion that the weighted average method has ceased to prove equitable to the pole setter. He reported that he had met with his staff to discuss and identify the issues in setting poles that are mutually beneficial to all and determine whether they are included in the current matrix used in establishing costs. What he discovered is that 90% of the variables are included in the matrix with an exception of a few, which would require minor modifications to the current matrix. The members agreed that they would address the current pole pricing methodology to arrive at a revised method in regards to the 2003 pole prices.

Next, Mr. Solorzano addressed **Item 1319: 2002 Pole Prices**. The proposed prices were originally on the Consent Calendar for the December Board meeting, but it was decided to move the proposed prices back to Authorized Costs for further discussion. The members discussed the proposed pole price spreadsheets at length for clarification. After extensive discussion, it was agreed by the members that the proposed pole prices would be on the Discussion Calendar of the January Administrative Board meeting agenda, with the possibility of moving it to the Consent Calendar for Board approval.

The next topic of discussion was **Item 1321: 2003 Pole Price Structure/Criteria**. Mr. Solorzano suggested reviewing the matrix and the definition of elements currently utilized by the members in arriving at their individual pole costs. He further stated that he is of the opinion that there are additional elements to be considered when setting pole prices. The members discussed the step by step procedures required in setting a pole. Mr. Solorzano reported that after discussion with his staff, he is proposing adding elements that are required for new pole setting. In that Mr. Solorzano and Mr. Bengtsson are the primary pole setters, they shared their thoughts on the labor and costs required for setting a pole, with the present Committee members. Some values mentioned by Mr. Solorzano were tailboards, set-up, and demobilization labor hours, in which he proposed including the hours in element five (digging and erecting). Mr. Bengtsson mentioned planning and engineering hours. Mr. Bengtsson stated that if an equitable matrix is created, would the weighted average work for everyone on a moving forward basis. Mr. Solorzano responded that, at this time, he would not support the weighted average method on a moving forward basis. It was then decided to insert a column titled Planning and Engineering to the matrix, and the Committee would discuss and arrive at a cost and definition. The members discussed this issue extensively. It was decided that the matrix was in need of revision, and that upon returning the members would be better prepared to discuss this further.

The next issue up for discussion was **Item 1300: Pole Set in Same Hole**. Ms. Hernandez stated that she continues to have a concern that by setting a standard cost would eventually eliminate field meets. Mr. Bengtsson stated that primarily, he also shared Ms. Hernandez's view, however, upon re-examining the issue further, he no longer is opposed to setting a standard cost for setting a pole in the same hole. Mr. Bengtsson stated that rather than one cost, perhaps create several scenarios and label them A, B, and C. Mr. Solorzano stated that in most instances there is no other alternative, but to set a pole in the same hole. He further stated that in previous meetings, he had suggested a cost, however, he could not recall the cost at this time. Ms. Corella was instructed to review past Authorized Cost meeting minutes for any reference to a standard cost for a pole set in the same hole. Ms. Corella responded stating she would have the minutes ready by the next meeting. The members decided that upon returning to their respective offices, they would research the cost of setting a pole in the same hole, and return next month with their costs for discussion.

In regards to **Item 1320: Vegetation Management/Fire Prevention**, Mr. Solorzano stated that he did not have anything to report on this issue at this time.

Under miscellaneous items, the members assigned two new item numbers. **Item 1323: Environmental Costs/2003 Pole prices**, which address costs required for consideration of environment conservation when, setting a pole. **Item 1324: Survey Costs** addresses the cost of a survey crew and will be assigned to Routine Revision as well. These new items will be addressed at future meetings.

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

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

444 E. Huntington Drive Ste. 205

Arcadia, CA 91006

Phone (626) 294-0821

Fax (626) 294-0872

February 19, 2002

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
- Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
- Ms. Sherri Goetz – So. Calif. Edison Co.
- Mr. Dennis Ennis – AT&T Wireless
- Mr. Craig Wayment – City of Glendale
- Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Ernie Solorzano opened the meeting at 9:10 am. The first issue on the agenda was **Item 1300: Pole set in Same Hole**. He stated that in prior meetings he had discussed an average cost for setting a pole in the same hole. That cost was in the range of \$600.00 to \$1,000.00. Mr. Bengtsson reported that previously discussed was creating costs associated with the level of difficulty from small, medium and large, or easy, average, and difficult. He also stated that the issue of field meets should be worked into the language in the Routine. After much discussion the members arrived at the Authorized Costs for Item 19, which are as follows:

- a) Pole placement located on street with riser.....\$700
- b) Pole placement located on street with riser.....\$850
- c) Pole placement on rear property.....\$1000

The issue would be on the Discussion Calendar of the February Administrative Board meeting for discussion and possible approval. The associated language for Section 7.4 would be addressed at the next Routine Revision.

The next issue on the agenda was **Item 1320: Vegetation Management**. Mr. Solorzano recommended a cost for Authorized Costs Item 13. The proposed revision would read as follows:

- 13. Pole access obstruction:
 - a) Clearing poles in State Responsibility Area.....\$16
(includes cost of contractor to perform activity and post Quality Control Inspection).

b) All other by Special Agreement Section 1.2.

This issue would be put on the Discussion Calendar of the February Administrative Board meeting for approval. If this item were approved Mr. Solorzano would like the cost retroactive to January 01, 2002.

The next topic of discussion was **Item 1323: Environmental Costs/2003 Pole Prices**. The primary concern with this issue is whether this cost should be imbedded in the pole prices or treated as a separate cost. It was decided to look at costs on a per pole basis.

Item 1324: Survey Costs was discussed next. Mr. Ennis reported that he researched survey costs and was given a rate of \$160.00 per site. Mr. Solorzano stated that upon returning to his office, he also would research survey costs. Mr. Lewis stated that survey costs should be based on an hourly rate. Mr. Bengtsson inquired as to how labor hours would be maintained. The members agreed that since this situation was rare, if an Authorized Cost was established, the Committee would have the responsibility of maintaining the cost annually. Mr. Lewis stated that survey costs fall under Authorized Costs Item 11-Joints Rights of Way (by Special Agreement). However, Mr. Solorzano stated that he would like to research this issue further within his organization, therefore, this item will remain open at this time.

Item 1321: 2003 Pole Price Structure/Criteria was the third agenda issue on the agenda for discussion. Mr. Solorzano reported that the 2002 pole prices had been approved, however, the criteria would be addressed. He opened the discussion by addressing SBC Pacific Bell's concerns. Ms. Hernandez stated that she wanted to ensure that the pole pricing criteria is uniform when arriving at pole prices. Mr. Lewis stated that element numbers 4, 5, and 8 should be hours agreed upon by the Committee. With numbers 7 and 9 being variable costs. Mr. Solorzano reported that he reviewed the pole price matrix and elements within his organization. He stated that Mr. Bengtsson had suggested imbedding a column that would address pre-planning and engineering, therefore, Mr. Solorzano reworked the matrix and added the suggested column, as well as additional hours to digging and erecting which would cover the costs of tail board meetings.

Mr. Solorzano then distributed a spreadsheet reflecting percentages of poles set by size and by members within a five year span. He stated the SCE has set nearly 70% of all poles within the last five years, and DWP setting 17%, with the majority, for both utilities, being pole replacements or new records. Mr. Solorzano distributed a spreadsheet of SCE 2002 Pole prices versus his proposed pole prices for 2002. He recommended revisiting the 2002 pole prices and increasing the prices due to items that were originally omitted. Mr. Lewis stated that if the 2002 prices were revisited and changed, that the prices remain in effect for two years. Mr. Lewis recommended Mr. Solorzano investigate as to whether SCE can accept the new approved pole prices for two years. Mr. Solorzano stated that he had reworked the spreadsheets that would reflect the new proposed prices for the weighted average, Edison and City of Pasadena. He added three hours to the digging and erecting, and one hour of loaded labor rate for pre-planning and engineering. Therefore, the only requirement would be that the Committee approves the revised pole prices. Mr. Bengtsson stated that although the 2002

pole prices have been approved, the Committee has the right to revisit and revise them if the prices are not equitable. The members discussed this issue at length. It was decided that Authorized Costs would meet on March 7, 2002 to discuss revising the 2002 pole prices.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m., until March 7, 2002.

Jean Baccus, Senior Billing Associate

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

444 E. Huntington Drive Ste. 205

Arcadia, CA 91006

Phone (626) 294-0821

Fax (626) 294-0872

March 7, 2002

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
- Ms. Ellen Blunt – Verizon California
- Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless
- Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
- Ms. Sherri Goetz – So. Calif. Edison Co.
- Mr. Dennis Ennis – AT&T Wireless
- Mr. Mike Bogner – Sprint PCS
- Mr. Mike Torelli – City of Riverside
- Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Guests:

- Larry Chow – Verizon California
- Art Peralta – Southern California Edison
- John Hoffman – Verizon Wireless
- Joe Piscotti – Southern California Edison

Chairman, Ernie Solorzano opened the meeting at 9:15 am. He announced that Mr. Piscotti of SCE would be speaking on pole loading issues later into the meeting. He then proceeded to the first issue on the agenda, **Item 1300: Pole set in Same Hole**. He stated that at previous meetings the members had discussed three common instances where placing a pole in the same hole would be necessary. The members agreed to put this item on the Discussion Calendar of the March Administrative Board meeting. The proposed language and costs are as follows:

19. Cost for placing pole back in the same hole:

- a) Pole placement located on street with riser.....\$700
- b) Pole placement located on street with riser.....\$850
- c) Pole placement on rear property with or without riser.....\$1000

The associated language for Section 7.4 would be addressed at the next Routine Revision.

Item 1321: 2003 Pole Price Structure/Criteria was the next issue discussed. Mr. Solorzano reported that the 2002 pole prices had been approved, however, he feels that the approved prices should be revised in that there are missing components in the approved prices. He reported that the pole price spreadsheets were reworked. What has been added is 3 additional hours to the digging and erecting, and an additional column for Pre-Planning and Engineering. The dollar amount in the Pre-planning and Engineering is equal to one labor hour for a specific member. He then distributed the spreadsheets for the wood weighted average, Edison, and City of Pasadena, as well as Edison's composite fiberglass and lightweight steel. The members then reviewed and discussed the spreadsheets. Mr. Solorzano stated that he would like these revised pole prices approved for 2002, retroactive to January 1, 2002. Ms. Hernandez stated that in her opinion the 2002 pole prices had already been approved for the year, therefore, she would not approve new prices. She further stated that when the 2002 pole prices were approved, it was with the caveat that the method, matrix and elements currently used for arriving at costs would be reviewed. The review would be in preparation for the 2003 pole price, not retroactively for the 2002 prices, which in her opinion had been accepted by all members and approved. Mr. Solorzano responded stating that in his opinion he did not have a problem with the current method and matrix. The members then reviewed the revised pole price sheets. Mr. Solorzano stated that the revised pole prices would be on the Consent Calendar of the March Administrative Board meeting for Committee approval. Ms. Hernandez stated that although Edison and power are the setting entities, telecommunication is the removal entity, therefore, not only the pole prices should be revisited, but the issue of PTD must also be addressed. The members agreed to discuss this separate issue at a future meeting.

Mr. Joe Piscotti of Southern California Edison gave a presentation on pole loading issues and compliance responsibility currently implemented by Southern California Edison.

The members discussed the idea of creating a pole loading ad hoc committee to create criteria to ensure that members are in line with GO 165. Mr. Bengtsson reiterated that the Committee is not, nor should attempt to become a regulatory body. It is the responsibility of every member to abide by the guidelines set by the CPUC since a requirement for membership is to be recognized by the CPUC as a utility. The members agreed to discuss pole loading further at future meetings.

Item 1324: Survey Costs was also on the day's agenda, however, the members agreed to close this item at this time.

Mr. Solorzano stated that **Item 1323: Environmental Costs/2003 Pole Prices** would not be discussed at this meeting, but would remain open for discussion at future meetings.

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

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

444 E. Huntington Drive Ste. 205

Arcadia, CA 91006

Phone (626) 294-0821

Fax (626) 294-0872

April 10, 2002

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
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Mr. Doug Schmaderder – City of Pasadena
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Ernie Solorzano opened the meeting at 9:15 am. The first issue on the agenda was **Item 1321: 2003 Pole Price Structure/Criteria**. He stated that this issue would be the primary topic of discussion for the meeting. Ms. Hernandez opened the discussing by stating that SBC Pacific Bell would not support revising the 2002 pole prices in 2002 after they have been voted on and approved. Mr. Solorzano questioned on what basis was Pac Bell basing its decision and position. Ms. Hernandez responded stating that changing the pole prices into the new year would not be in line with the Committee By-Laws. She further stated that if the prices were revised, precedence would be set for future decisions that are not within the parameters of the Committee By-Laws. Mr. Bengtsson stated that in the previous year prices were changed into the year by dropping DWPs prices, therefore, precedence had been set. Mr. Lewis stated that he would not be opposed to changing the pole prices into the year, however, the revised prices would remain in effect until December 2003.

Ms. Hernandez stated that in her opinion she felt the revised pole prices required more discussion before bringing them to the Board meeting for approval. She is of the opinion that the ad hoc committee members, as well as all other members, were not given sufficient time to review and digest the revised prices within their respective organizations. She further stated that Item 5 (PTD) of the Authorized Costs should be reviewed as she had stated in earlier meetings. Mr. Solorzano inquired if Ms. Hernandez had reviewed the issue of PTD, and had any information or data to share with the Committee. Ms. Hernandez responded that she did not at this time because, she was not aware that this issue was ready for discussion. However, she would return next month with data on PTD. Ms. Lewis interjected that he did not have any data on PTD, but would also return next month with information to share with the ad hoc Committee. He further stated that he would like to ensure all components included in this construction are correct, therefore, he would need to review this scenario with his

construction managers. The members discussed the components involved in the pulling, transporting and disposing of a pole. They agreed that if the pole prices were reviewed for the benefit of the pole setting utilities, than the pulling, transporting, and disposing costs should be reviewed for the benefit of the pole removing utilities. The members assigned **Item 1328: Review of Auth Cost Item 5 (PTD)** to this committee for future review and discussion. Mr. Lewis stated that in his opinion, both the revised pole prices and the revised PTD costs should be voted on simultaneously. The members will discuss these issues further at future meetings, with the objective of pole price and PTD costs approved by no later than mid-year.

The members then discussed the current pole pricing matrix used by members to determine their individual pole costs. Previously, the members had agreed that the matrix is in need of review. Mr. Solorzano opened the discussion by stating that an additional column has been added to the matrix. The column header reads "Pre-Planning and Engineering Fee". Mr. Solorzano has created the associated definition for the additional matrix element that reads as follows:

Pre-Planning and Engineering Fee/Hours – This fee/associated hour(s) is established to identify the analysis required to determine the scope of work to be preformed in the field, prior to the actual planning and construction work order preparation to place or replace a pole. The cost should be based on the submitted loaded labor rate by each utility multiplied by the amount of hour(s) taken to perform this task on a per pole basis.

Per Mr. Solorzano, the recommended time for this element is 1 hour. After researching the transporting and handling time within his organization, Mr. Solorzano suggested increasing the labor hours for this element from 2.0 to 3.75. The members reviewed and discussed each column individually. The members agreed to have the matrix ready for approval by no later than mid-year.

Ms. Hernandez inquired into the lightweight steel pole prices. She stated that she does not recall the Committee approving the crane costs imbedded in the pole prices. She stated that she reviewed prior minutes and could locate any reference to crane cost approval. Mr. Solorzano responded that he would research this issue prior to the next Authorized Costs meeting.

The last issue on the agenda was **Item 1323: Environmental Costs/2003 Pole Prices**. The Committee did not discuss this issue at this meeting; however, it will remain an open item at this time.

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

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

444 E. Huntington Drive Ste. 205

Arcadia, CA 91006

Phone (626) 294-0821

Fax (626) 294-0872

April 30, 2002

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. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless

Mr. Dan Lewis – Verizon California

Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (DWP)

Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless

Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Ernie Solorzano opened the meeting at 9:15 am. The first issue discussed was **Item 1328: Review of Auth Costs Item 5 (PTD)**. Mr. Solorzano asked Mr. Lewis and Ms. Hernandez if they would share the information they acquired in their research of pulling, transporting, and disposing of poles within their respective organizations. Mr. Lewis reported that he spoke with the construction managers within his organization. He stated their estimate was 10 hours on the street and an additional 5 hours for rear property. Ms. Hernandez reported that the information on PTD that she received from her organization is also 10 hours on the street and an additional 6 hours for rear property. Mr. Solorzano then inquired if the members agreed that the average hours for this construction, whether on the street or rear property is 13 labor hours. Mr. Brown reported that the information supplied by the contractors his organization employs is a flat rate of \$650.00 for pulling, transporting, and disposing of a pole. Mr. Lewis suggested agreeing on one cost per pole. Ms. Dell suggested the average cost be based on a fifty-foot pole, because the majority of poles set today are fifty feet.

Ms. Hernandez stated that since the cost of pre-planning and engineering is imbedded in the cost of setting a pole, it should be included in the cost of removing a pole. She stated that the removing party also performs this function. The members agreed with Ms. Hernandez that this cost should be included in the cost of removing a pole.

The members discussed the three components of removing a pole. The consensus was that the labor would be thirteen hours. An additional hour would be included for pre-planning and engineering. The labor rate the Committee agreed on is \$68.00 per hour. The members discussed combining pulling and transporting, however, after much discussion they decided it would be wiser that they remain separate costs. The Committee decided that the cost of transporting a pole would be \$150.00 per all poles (regardless of length). The members arrived at the following formula: 14 labor hours at \$68.00/hr = \$952.00. They decided that

the proposed transporting cost would equal \$150.00 per pole and they would decrease the pulling cost by this amount.

The members then discussed disposal of a pole. Rather than a per foot cost, the members decided on proposing a flat cost of \$60.00 per pole. The proposed costs and language will read as follows:

Proposed Costs and Language for Authorized Costs Item 5. -

5. Removing from service:

(a) Pulling.....	per pole	802
*includes 1 hour pre-planning and engineering		
(b) Transporting.....	per pole	150
(c) Topping Pole.....		225
*based on 2 cuts, topping and lowering.		
(d) Disposal.....	per pole	60

It was agreed that this would be on the May 15, 2002 Administrative Board meeting agenda for discussion.

The next issue for discussion on the agenda was **Item 1321: 2003 Pole Price Structure/Criteria**. The members discussed the format for the pole-pricing matrix. At prior meetings the members had created an additional element column for pre-planning and engineering, and the language for the definition of the new column. This item will also be on the Discussion Calendar of the May Administrative Board meeting.

The last item discussed was the proposed revised 2002 pole prices. These prices are the same prices that had been on the Consent Calendar earlier this year. However, it was returned to Authorized Costs for further review. Ms. Hernandez stated she had an issue with the lightweight steel pole prices. She reported that she could not find where crane costs had been discussed extensively or approved in any Committee meeting minutes. Therefore, it was agreed that the lightweight steel pole prices would not be included in the discussion of the proposed revised 2002 pole prices at this time. Upon returning the members would discuss the lightweight steel prices further.

Item 1323: Environmental Costs/2003 Pole Prices was second on the agenda. The members agreed to close this item at this time. If it were discovered that this issue needs discussion in the future, a new item number would be addressed.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m., until May 2002.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

444 E. Huntington Drive Ste. 205

Arcadia, CA 91006

Phone (626) 294-0821

Fax (626) 294-0872

July 17, 2002

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. Lupe Hernandez - Pacific Bell
Mr. Ernie Solorzano - So. Calif. Edison Co.
Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless
Ms. Velma Prouty – SBC Pacific Bell
Mr. Dan Lewis – Verizon California
Mr. John Foltz – City of Los Angeles (DWP)
Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless
Mr. Corey Autrey – Sprint PCS
Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Ernie Solorzano opened the meeting at 11:15 am. Mr. Solorzano opened the discussion of grounding. He inquired if any members were bonding to Edison ground. The members responded stating those years ago this may have occurred, however, this practice is not being performed today. Mr. Solorzano stated that his organization during detailed inspections have reported seeing disk strips, ground molding, and guide guards. He further stated that he has requested from his organization requirements that are mutually beneficial to pole owners and why they are beneficial. He will review the requirements for benefits, then bring them to the Committee for review and discussion as to the agreement of benefits. Mr. Solorzano stated that one purpose of the detailed pole inspections is to identify any GO95 infractions, identify the member utility in violation, and notify the member utility. Mr. Solorzano stated that he upon his return next month he would share more information on this issue with the members.

Ms. Corella stated that the billing staff had questions in regards to the revised Authorized Costs Item 5 (a, b, d). Their concern is with AC item 5(c) pole topping and how it is reflected on a JPA. The members discussed as to why the PTD costs were separated. The primary driver is when placing a pole in the same hole the JPA reflects the separate portions. The JPA reflects one utility with PB, and the second utility reflects LTD.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m., until August 2002.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

444 E. Huntington Drive Ste. 205

Arcadia, CA 91006

Phone (626) 294-0821

Fax (626) 294-0872

August 21, 2002

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 1:30 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Velma Prouty - Pacific Bell

Mr. Ernie Solorzano - So. Calif. Edison Co.

Ms. Sherri Goetz – So. Calif. Edison Co.

Mr. Malcolm Brown – Verizon Wireless

Ms. Lynn Prescott – Verizon Wireless

Mr. Dan Lewis – Verizon California

Mr. Robert Allen – City of Los Angeles (DWP)

Ms. Kathleen Dell – AT&T Wireless

Mr. Corey Autrey – Sprint PCS

Ms. Jennie Corella - Committee Staff

Chairman, Ernie Solorzano opened the meeting at 1:30 am. The first topic on the agenda was Item 1330: Revised 2002-2003 Lightweight Steel Prices. Mr. Solorzano reported that he was not ready to address this issue at the time and would need more time to work on this issue within his organization. This item will remain open at this time.

Under miscellaneous/Item numbers Mr. Solorzano stated that he would like to open a new item for the issue of visibility strips. Item number 1334 has been assigned to this issue. Mr. Solorzano opened the discussion by stating that a cost should be established for the installation of visibility strips. He stated that there is not a GO 95 requirement for the installation of visibility strips, however, there is a Cal-Trans requirement when poles are on the road or curbside. He further stated that when a vehicle hits a pole, or a curbside pole harms a pedestrian, SCE is questioned if the pole had a visibility strip for safety precaution. Therefore, he is of the opinion that the installation of visibility strips would be beneficial to pole owners in regards to public safety. Mr. Solorzano distributed a sheet describing the criteria for installing visibility strips on poles within SCE. According to Mr. Solorzano previously, there was an Authorized Costs in the Routine Handbook for the installation of visibility strips. Mr. Solorzano stated that material and labor for installation of viz strips is \$7.73 per pole. He proposed establishing viz strips as an Authorized Cost into the Routine Handbook. The members will discuss this issue at the next meeting. If the members agree on the Authorized Cost, this item will go before the Board for approval at the following meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m., until September 18, 2002.

Jennie Corella, Office Manager