

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

January 9, 2007

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. Robert Allen	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Velma Prouty	AT&T California
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Ms. Brandi Coonce	Cingular Wireless
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena
Mr. Justin Cashmer	Verizon California
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS
Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks (teleconference)
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	Cingular Wireless (teleconference)
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

Mr. Allen called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m., and addressed the first agenda issue, **Item 1341: Storm Costs**. This item was brought to the table by SCE. Ms. Goetz reported that SCE has no action to report at this time. This item would remain open for further discussion. She added that the status on **Item 1360: Crane Costs**, and **Item 1361: Removal of Vegetation** are on similar status.

Mr. Allen reported that **Item 1361: Removal of Vegetation**, **Item 1366: Review Anchor, Overhead and Down Guys**, and **Item 1419: Vegetation Management Program** would be tabled at this time.

Discussion was opened on **Item 1415: 2007 Authorized Costs**. Ms. Corella stated that there were some corrections to the first draft of the proposed authorized costs average worksheet. She reported the changes, and the members corrected their respective copies.

Ms. Corella noted that the stated SCE proposed additional authorized costs listed at the end of the draft have previously been assigned item numbers. It was agreed that prior to discussing any additional costs, the members would discuss the proposed costs to the existing authorized costs item numbers.

Ms. Prouty questioned the SCE submitted costs for AC item 3-lowering and raising, she stated that SCE costs appear much higher than the other submitted power utility costs. Mr. Chow responded that the costs have not been reviewed in this detailed manner in over ten years. He added that he is not aware what method to determine costs was utilized in the past. Perhaps, some cost elements that are included in SCE current submitted costs are missing in the other power utility submitted costs. Ms. Prouty inquired the labor size of an SCE crew. She questioned if the crew works on joint pole work only, or SCE work. Mr. Chow responded that the crew is called out for joint use work only, and the job requires one crew to complete the required function. Mr. Allen added that he would require dispatching a line crew to work on a joint pole, regardless if the job requires one communication worker, or two communication workers; it is required to dispatch the entire line crew.

Ms. Hernandez interjected that she has concern with the costs of authorized costs item 1 – Trenching and moving (70 ft pole). Her question is why SCE costs are nearly doubled those costs of the City of Pasadena, and the City of Los Angeles.

Mr. Chow responded that 70 foot-plus poles require transmission work. The costs reflect that work performed by transmission crews, which in regards to costs, the costs are greater than costs for a distribution crew. Ms. Hernandez questioned the other power members if this scenario is similar within their organization. Mr. Allen responded that his crews do not differentiate between transmission, and distribution. DWP crews handle all length poles. Mr. Allen questioned SCE as to the difference between the two type crews. Mr. Chow responded that the difference is overhead, and crew size. Ms. Hernandez stated that other members should not be required to bear the cost of a larger crew size, since this is an SCE requirement. She questioned the power members if they would more readily replace a pole, than moving it. Mr. Allen responded that DWP would replace rather than move a pole. Mr. Chow responded that the trenching costs were included in the proposal by SCE because they were listed on the matrix, and are existing costs. However, he added that many action items, (trenching a good example) are no longer being practiced by SCE.

Ms. Hernandez than questioned, if in a situation where a pole could be moved or replaced, do the other joint members have the option to request a pole to be replaced, rather than moved. The members agreed that this is correct, and that members have the option of requesting another action. Ms. Hernandez stated that rather than paying for an eight-man crew, the members should agree on an average crew size, and base the costs on this. Mr. Chow responded that he is under the impression that the purpose of submitting costs is to determine what it cost individual members to transact a particular action item. The members agreed with Mr. Chow, however, on behalf of their organizations, they must inquire if costs appear unreasonably high.

Mr. Chow stated that all members utilize different components to arrive at their costs. Since there is no standardized list of elements or

components to use when compiling costs, the result is a large range between proposed costs.

Ms. Prescott stated that all members who submit proposed costs should be prepared to provide the other members with data on how they arrived at any questionable proposed cost.

Mr. Chow stated that SCE utilized the pole price matrix as a template, taking into account those elements that applied. The other members responded that they did not use the pole price matrix at arriving at their costs. Mr. Allen stated that all costs are taken into account by the program that is utilized at DWP.

The members discussed the matrix and the elements. It was agreed to create a list of components to be used when creating authorized costs. It was agreed to assign an item number to creating the authorized costs matrix. **Item 1429: Authorized Costs Elements Matrix Worksheet** has been assigned to this ad hoc committee. The members reviewed, and discussed each element in the pole price matrix to determine if it applies to authorize costs.

After reviewing the elements, the consensus is that not all members would be using some, or all the elements. It was agreed that the members would return to their organizations, and use the pole price matrix as a template, and apply only those elements that appear applicable to the costs of performing an action within their respective organizations. Mr. Allen stated that upon returning next month, if a member's submitted cost is questioned, that member must be prepared to provide which elements were applied to the cost.

The new item number would be placed on the discussion calendar of the January board meeting.

Item 1421: 2007 Pole Prices was discussed next. The members are in agreement with the submitted pole prices for 2007. Therefore, the submitted costs would be on the consent calendar of the January board meeting for board approval.

The last issues for discussion are **Item 1425: Fiberglass Wrap/per foot cost**, and **Item 1426: Additional Steel/Wood Stub Price**. SCE is proposing the addition of AC Item 17-D Fiberglass Wrap restoration – additional foot exceeding 8-foot standard of \$82.00. The members discussed this, and agreed to note that a standard wrap is eight feet on AC items a, b, and c. The consensus is to place this issue on the discussion calendar of the next board meeting.

SCE is proposing additional steel/wood stub costs. The ad hoc is in agreement of the proposed costs. Item 1426: Additional Steel/wood stub costs will be on the January discussion calendar of the agenda.

The last SCE submitted proposal to authorized costs is a cost for AC Item 11: Joint Rights of Way. SCE is proposing a cost of \$1186.00. The

members discussed this proposal, and agreed to leave the proposal on the body of the AC matrix average submitted costs for board discussion.

LAC is proposing a new AC cost Item 97: Transfer meter circuit breaker box/disconnect box with a cost of \$1280.00. The members discussed this issue, and item number 1429 has been assigned to this proposal.

All AC proposals will be on the discussion calendar of the January 17, 2007 board meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m. The next meeting would be scheduled at the next Board meeting.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

February 13, 2007

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:

Mr. Robert Allen	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Velma Prouty	AT&T California
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena
Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Mr. Kourtney Aboudara	NextG Networks
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	Cingular Wireless
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

Mr. Allen called the meeting to order at 11:15 a.m., and addressed the first agenda issue, **Item 1341: Storm Costs**. Mr. Chow opened discussion by inquiring if the attending members agreed, or not, that the member called out in emergencies should be compensated for premium costs. Mr. Allen responded that according to his recollection, this item is for storm situations when an entire line of poles is down, and not for calling out a crew to replace a single pole during off-hours. Ms. Prouty added that this is for the overtime pay to any member that has expensed premium pay to their crews working off-hours in order to return service to customers.

Ms. Hernandez reported that Mr. Solorzano had proposed a cost of \$2,078.00, and had promised to provide documentation to support the proposed cost. Ms. Corella added that Mr. Solorzano did not provide documentation.

Mr. Allen stated that DWP has an emergency crew available 24/7 to handle emergency situations. Mr. Chow referred to the recent Esparanza fire, where SCE was called out. Crews do not work their normal work hours, they continue working through weekends, and evenings until the job is complete. Unlike emergency crews who handle situations as they occur, these crews are created and assembled to work on a specific emergency continuous project.

Ms. Prouty stated that her organization would not support the reimbursement for overtime to any joint member.

Mr. Chow stated that in regards to AT&T's position on this item he inquired as to the position of the other members in moving forward with this item.

Mr. Allen responded that in extraordinary situations, like the Esparanza fire, members should be allowed some compensation for projects that require more than a days work. But not in the day-to-day emergency situations that can be handled in a short period. However, extraordinary situations can be handled via special agreement. He added that these extraordinary situations should be precisely defined, and spelled out in order to ensure they fit the definition of the authorized costs item.

Ms. Haney stated that originally she was not in agreement of this proposal, based on the fact that the nature and location of power company's facilities, dictates that they must be the initial respondents. She added that communication companies should not be held responsible for the overtime conditions due to the nature of the power companies business.

Mr. Allen queried how the proposed authorized cost would be applied. Would it be per pole cost, per job, or per JPA? Ms. Hernandez responded that she is of the opinion that it is a per pole cost. She referred to a previous discussion on how would a member differentiate between solely, and jointly owned poles. Mr. Chow responded that an organization could not determine and/or identify poles to work on while on straight time or premium time. A job order does not operate in this manner.

Mr. Chow added that his objective in inquiring if the members would like to move forward with this item is to gain an understanding of this proposal, since it was brought to the table prior to his joining SCE.

Ms. Hernandez stated that in her opinion, this situation should continue to be handled via Section 1.2, special agreement.

Ms. Prouty added that she is of the opinion that this type situation should be discussed prior, and handled via 1.2, and both parties should agree on the costs.

Mr. Chow responded that when handling JPA's via 1.2, in many instances, communication districts do not agree, one district might approve the cost, with a second district requesting to negotiate the cost. An authorized cost eliminates some arguments, and delays in the processing of JPAs. He added that the proposed authorized cost falls far below actual costs. If Section 1.2 is utilized, then, SCE would likely attempt to recoup as much costs as possible.

Ms. Haney inquired if Mr. Chow could provide examples of this type situation. Mr. Chow responded that SCE has not tried to recover storm costs he was referring to situations when Section 1.2 is utilized.

Ms. Hernandez reiterated as to how SCE intends to determine if the overtime is for joint use poles, or solely owned poles.

Mr. Chow responded that this is an accounting issue, and the turn around time to obtain the accounting documentation on a work order is lengthy. Mr. Chow then inquired if SCE is able to get the exact documentation to the members, would the members agree to pay their portion of the costs. Ms. Hernandez again inquired if the proposed cost is a

per pole cost. Mr. Chow responded that he assumes it is, however, he would research the cost when he returns to his organization.

Mr. Chow concluded by stating that there are two options to resolving this issue, 1) arrive and agree on an authorized costs, or 2) utilize Section 1.2, and when accounting documentation is presented to joint members that the members agree that they would accept the costs derived from the exact accounting documentation without negotiation, per the agreement by authorized costs committee meeting of said date.

Ms. Hernandez stated that if SCE could present the breakdown of hours used to arrive at the proposed AC of \$2,078.00. Mr. Chow reiterated that he would research the proposed cost when he returns to his organization, and present it to the members at the next meeting. This item would remain open at this time.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1360: Crane Costs**. Mr. Chow reported that his organization would put together a presentation addressing the use of cranes, and helicopters. The presentation would demonstrate when cranes, and helicopters are needed and utilized. This item would remain open at this time.

The third issue on the agenda is **Item 1361: Removal of Vegetation**. Ms. Prouty opened discussion by stating that AT&T California does not support creating an authorized cost for this action. She added that she would like to maintain item 13.B as special agreement. Ms. Hernandez stated that in some instances the fact that a pole had vegetation removed is questionable, because in the time it takes to field check, the obstructed pole has been replaced. Mr. Chow responded that joint members have 45 days to verify pole conditions. Ms. Haney stated that in some instances, a final bill is received with the Form 48 attached.

Mr. Chow inquired if 13.B remains special agreement, would the members have difficulty in approving a \$500.00 charge versus a \$100.00. In this situation would the members request a copy of the SCE invoice? He added that SCE is not allowed to disclose copies of their vendor invoices, due to the possibility that vendor competitors may view it.

Ms. Prouty responded that her organization does not differentiate, but requests invoice copies on all section 13.B items. She added that she chooses to stand on maintaining 13.B as it is today.

Mr. Allen suggested that members return to their organizations, and research their respective costs for this type action.

Ms. Hernandez interjected that the members do not necessarily oppose the dollars; it is that items are being added to JPAs. Mr. Allen added that it is the quality of the submitted JPAs.

Mr. Chow responded that all members are experiencing retirees within their organizations, and coping with the learning curve required for new hires. The quality of work is affected when employees are in training mode. He added that the members would be better served if they support one another during these trying times.

Mr. Chow stated that the purpose of proposing authorized costs is to ease joint transactions, and eliminate discussions and negotiations in regards to action items. Mr. Chow added that he supports utilizing Section 1.2, however, he would like members to either agree to disagree on the cost based on the cost itself. In many instances members request a copy of the vendor invoice, or request breakdown of the exact cost. He would like to reduce the negotiation time taken when 1.2 is utilized.

Mr. Allen stated that creating a cost for 13.B appears reasonable. He referred to Items 10 a, b, and c., in that sidewalk repairs are similar to pole obstruction, and sidewalk repairs have an agreed upon authorized costs. Her reiterated his suggestion to the members that they obtain the costs from their organization for this type of work.

The final consensus is that members will return next month with their respective costs for this action item.

Item 1366: Review Anchor, Overhead and Down Guys, is the next topic of discussion. The concern with this issue is that members are purchasing into anchors at a greater cost than that of purchasing into a pole. Ms. Hernandez stated that she is in agreement that anchors do not depreciate, however, they should not appreciate. She added that DWP agreed to provide documentation supporting their argument against this proposal. Ms. Prouty reported that Mr. Walls had originally provided a proposal that appeared favorable to the ad hoc members. It allowed anchor depreciation at an annual percentage rate.

Mr. Allen apologized for not providing the documentation, and proposed tabling this item until the next meeting. This item will remain open for further discussion

Discussion was opened on **Item 1429: Authorized Costs Elements Matrix Worksheet**. Ms. Prouty opened the discussion by stating that she discussed this issue with Mr. Bob Wolfe. Ms. Prouty stated that she reviewed the pole price elements definitions matrix, and lined out those that, in her opinion, do not apply to authorized costs. Ms. Hernandez stated that since authorized costs are in addition to poles prices, some pole price elements should not be included in the authorized costs matrix, since they exist in the cost of the pole.

The members reviewed every column on the pole price matrix to determine if it is applicable to authorized costs.

The members discussed each individual column extensively, and arrived at a total of eight columns (see attachment).

The consensus is to have the matrix approved by the Board at the next Board meeting, and to utilize it for the incoming year's proposed authorized costs.

The members discussed the current submitted proposed costs (**Item 1415: 2007 Authorized Costs**), and have a concern with AC Item number's 1, 2, 9, 10-B, 18, and 19.

At the next meeting the ad hoc members would review, and discuss the aforementioned AC Item numbers of the proposed 2007 costs extensively, and agree or disagree on the amounts.

The members broke for lunch, and resumed the meeting at 1:00 pm. Ms. Hernandez opened discussion on traffic control by requesting clarification on the requirements for flagmen. She stated that her organization is of the opinion that a flagman is not necessarily required to control traffic when signs would suffice. Mr. Chow responded that many municipalities require flagmen to control traffic in their jurisdictions.

Ms. Hernandez stated that in many instances her office receives a JPA quoting, "flagman charges to follow". She inquired if SCE is aware of the charges initially. Mr. Chow responded that the purpose of the quote is because, members continue to request vendor invoice copies. He added that the vendor invoice is the back end of the process, where the JPA is the front end of the process.

Ms. Goetz added that the purpose of the quote on the JPA is to notify the members to be prepared to receive an additional cost.

Ms. Hernandez responded that how is a member to approve a JPA if they are unaware of the total charge. Therefore, prior to signing the prelim, Ms. Hernandez runs a line through the quote. She added that this action should cancel out in that both parties would need to provide flagmen at the site, since both parties visit the site at different times.

Mr. Allen inquired about the cost. Ms. Hernandez responded that the cost varies. Ms. Goetz added that many times the cost may cancel out, and other times they do not depending on the dynamics of the job. Mr. Chow stated that the benefit of establishing an authorized cost to actions, is that everyone is aware of the agreed upon costs.

Ms. Hernandez stated that her objective for this discussion is to gain clarification of traffic control costs, in order to aid her in arriving at an authorized cost proposal or approval. She inquired how a member could differentiate between joint pole hours, and solely owned pole hours. She suggested perhaps arriving at a set number of labor hours.

Mr. Allen stated that DWP normally contracts traffic control work, and does not reflect it on the JPA.

Ms. Prouty and Ms. Hernandez added that they also do not charge for this type work.

Ms. Hernandez reiterated that her concern is when should it be allowed to charge for traffic control, or should it be considered a wash between members. She suggested bringing this issue to the table on at next Board meeting. She stated her stand, and recommendation on this issue. If both parties visit the work location, then the costs cancel out. If only one member visits the work location, then the cost is shared.

Ms. Hernandez requested clarification on Item 112-D: Sale of abandoned anchors. Mr. Chow responded that abandonment is when all members are removed from the anchor, unlike a member relinquishing. The last joint member to remove their facilities from the anchor must physically remove the entire anchor. Per GO 95 the anchor must be removed.

The next item number discussed is Item 19 Pole set in same hole. Ms. Hernandez requested clarification as to why the cost is greater when setting a pole in the same hole.

Mr. Chow responded that it is much more labor intensive and costly to remove a pole, and place another in the same hole. It requires much more equipment than just setting a pole. Ms. Haney added that it requires extra equipment to support the old pole and all its attachments while the new pole is being placed.

Ms. Hernandez then inquired if it is feasible to apply the AC matrix to item 19. since some cost elements are in the cost of placing a pole.

Mr. Chow responded that it would be only those hours above and beyond digging and erecting. A second option he suggested is that all members calculate the hours it would take their respective organizations to complete this action item, and deduct the hours of digging and erecting from the pole price matrix. This would result in the over and above hours of digging and erecting.

Ms. Hernandez stated she would like a clear understanding of this action item in order to calculate proposed AC costs.

Mr. Allen stated that there is a large difference between 19 – A, B, and C. Mr. Chow stated that when risers are added to the equation, the labor intensity increases. He added when a pole is on a property line or in rear property, in many instances this requires manual labor, which is even costlier.

Ms. Hernandez stated that she understands that she should create costs for all three scenarios.

She added that in reference to risers, DWP normally identifies whose riser it is, and charges Item 19 to that joint member. However, SCE does not apply this process, they charge all members the same cost. In her opinion, she feels this process should be standardized.

Mr. Chow queried Mr. Allen the process applied to identify riser ownership. Mr. Allen responded the information is from DWP records.

Ms. Hernandez stated that a standard should be set that when a pole is placed in the same hole in regards to risers. The risers should be charged (Item 19) to the joint pole owner of the said risers. She added that this principle should be applied to antennas and terminals or any other equipment. Ms. Prouty suggested adding another item to 19 to address terminal and antennas. Mr. Chow suggested adding the verbiage, “and/or equipment”. Mr. Chow added that it should not be determined on the quantity of risers, but if a member has one riser, or more risers they will be charged $\frac{1}{2}$ /1. It was agreed to add the verbiage, “and/or equipment” to Items 19 A, B, and C.

Lastly, Mr. Allen requested that **Item 1419: Vegetation Management Program** be tabled at this time.

The meeting adjourned at 1:25 p.m. The next meeting would be scheduled at the next Board meeting.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

Attachment

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Item Number	Power/Comm/Both	Direct Labor (loaded)	Total Labor Hours	Total Direct Labor (\$)	Material Cost (FOB)	General & Admin	Total Cost
1-Trenching/Moving 30' WITH supply	Power			0			0
1-Trenching/Moving 35' WITH supply	Power			0			0
1-Trenching/Moving 40' WITH supply	Power			0			0
1-Trenching/Moving 45' WITH supply	Power			0			0
1-Trenching/Moving 50' WITH supply	Power			0			0
1-Trenching/Moving 55' WITH supply	Power			0			0
1-Trenching/Moving 60' WITH supply	Power			0			0
1-Trenching/Moving 65' WITH supply	Power			0			0
1-Trenching/Moving 70' WITH supply	Power			0			0
1-Trenching/Moving 75' WITH supply	Power			0			0
1-Trenching/Moving 80' WITH supply	Power			0			0
1-Trenching/Moving 85' WITH supply	Power			0			0
1-Trenching/Moving 90' WITH supply	Power			0			0
1-Trenching/Moving 95' WITH supply	Power			0			0
1-Trenching/Moving 100' WITH supply	Power			0			0
2-Trenching/Moving 30' WITHOUT supply	Communication			0			0
2-Trenching/Moving 35' WITHOUT supply	Communication			0			0
2-Trenching/Moving 40' WITHOUT supply	Communication			0			0
2-Trenching/Moving 45' WITHOUT supply	Communication			0			0
2-Trenching/Moving 50' WITHOUT supply	Communication			0			0
2-Trenching/Moving 55' WITHOUT supply	Communication			0			0

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

March 13, 2007

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:

Mr. Richard Freyre	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Velma Prouty	AT&T California (teleconference)
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS
Mr. Kourtney Aboudara	NextG Networks
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	Cingular Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

The meeting opened with discussion on **Item 1415: 2007 Authorized Costs**. Mr. Chow requested that SCE's costs on the questionable items be removed from the average. SCE would accept those average costs submitted by the remaining power utilities. He added that it is late in the year, and the 2007 authorized costs should be approved and published.

Ms. Baccus added that the JPC office has received some 2007 JPAs.

Ms. Hernandez questioned AC 19. She stated that it appears some members have included the pole replacement costs, rather than just the difference, which is the additional cost of placing a pole in the same hole. She reported that initially, her organization had miscalculated the costs by including the pole placement costs.

Mr. Chow stated that the traditional dig and erect costs are not included in the additional incremental authorized costs that are submitted by SCE. The dig and erect costs are in the pole prices. Ms. Thomas interjected that it appears that the dig and erect costs are in fact included in some members AC costs.

Ms. Hernandez stated that it appears the cost for 19-A, submitted by SCE, is double the costs submitted by other power members. Therefore, giving the impression and appearance that the dig and erect costs have been included. Ms. Thomas agreed that the SCE submitted cost for this item appears high.

Ms. Hernandez stated that she is not opposed to the dollars; however, she is of the opinion that the method utilized by members to arrive at these costs should be standardized.

Mr. Chow inquired of the communications members, when they calculated their costs, are they utilizing labor rates comparable to that of qualified electrical workers, or labor communication rates.

Ms. Prouty responded that AT&T California utilizes communication labor rates.

Mr. Chow stated that utilizing communication labor rates would result in artificially lower rates than power.

The consensus on this item is to remove the requested SCE costs from the AC matrix. Mr. Cox stated that he would be re-submitting his costs. The matrix would be on the discussion calendar of March 21, 2007 Board meeting agenda.

The members then addressed the remaining items on the agenda. Ms. Corella reported that SCE would provide the documentation on how the proposed cost of \$2,078.00 was calculated for **Item 1341: Storm Costs**. This item would remain open at this time.

Ms. Goetz reported that SCE did not have any information on **Item 1360: Crane Costs**, and **Item 1361: Removal of Vegetation**.

Mr. Freyre stated that he did not have anything to add to **Item 1366: Review Anchor, Overhead, and Down Guys at this time** or **Item 1419: Vegetation Management Program**. He recommends that these items remain open until Mr. Robert Allen returns next month.

There were no miscellaneous items. The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for April 17, 2007

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

April 17, 2007

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. Robert Allen	City of LA -DWP (teleconference)
Ms. Velma Prouty	AT&T California
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS
Mr. Kourtney Aboudara	NextG Networks
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	Cingular Wireless
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Steve Rodriguez	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Daniel Lippert	City of Burbank
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff

Items 1341: Storm Costs, 1360: Crane Costs, and 1361: Removal of Ivy were not discussed per Mr. Larry Chow, due to no action, or current information on these issues. These items are tabled for the next Authorized Costs meeting.

Next on the agenda is **Item 1366: Review Anchor, Overhead and Down Guys**. Mr. Allen stated that he is now in agreement that anchors should be depreciated, and agrees with the proposal presented by Ms. Hernandez. The ad hoc would finalize this item at the next meeting, prior to Board presentation.

The members then discussed **Item 1415: 2007 Authorized Costs**. Ms. Goetz noted a calculation error on page 5, item 18.C. Ms. Baccus noted the error, and would make the correction.

Ms. Hernandez stated that the City of Pasadena has submitted their revised costs for Item's 19, in that at the prior meeting, the costs appeared relatively high. Ms. Hernandez inquired of Mr. Cox if Item 19.C should be blank. Mr. Cox responded that he did not submit a cost for 19.C (set pole in same hole-rear property-w or w/o riser).

He further stated that Pasadena does not utilize this type action. He added that it is near to impossible, and time intensive.

Mr. Allen responded that DWP transacts this operation. Mr. Cox responded that he would like the opportunity to field meet with DWP when they perform this type operation.

Mr. Allen explained how DWP performs the operation, and added that it is common practice within the department.

Ms. Prouty inquired if a field meet could be scheduled for the members when DWP performs this operation (19-C). Mr. Allen responded that he would contact Mr. Freyre to organize a meeting with the members whenever the department performs this type operation.

The members noted that some members did not submit a revised proposed cost, but rather merely used the existing cost.

Mr. Allen stated that authorized costs have not been reviewed individually, per item in nearly ten years. Therefore, those members that insert the existing cost as their proposed cost, may cause the result to reflect an artificially low average cost. He added that it does not appear reasonable that a member is able to perform an action today, at the same cost of approximately ten years ago.

Mr. Chow agreed with Mr. Allen in that members continue to input the existing cost as their proposed cost. The objection of the exercise, by the ad hoc, to create an AC matrix is to aid members in arriving at current, reasonable proposed item costs.

Ms. Hernandez stated that perhaps, the ad hoc wasn't clear with their direction for the members. It was announced that the newly created matrix would be used moving forward, and not for the current costs.

Ms. Prescott suggested, that perhaps, the next time the authorized costs matrix is sent to the members, the existing costs should be omitted. The members agreed to revisit authorized costs again in 2008, and to omit the existing costs on the original matrix that is initially sent to members.

Ms. Goetz stated that item 93 average should read, "price by agreement", and not a zero value. It was agreed that the entire roll should read as such. The same should apply to items 109, 199, 149, 199, 164-C, 13-B, 32, and 49.

Under item 11, Edison's cost, and the notation on the last pag, are to be removed from the matrix.

The final draft for the proposed authorized costs will be on the discussion calendar of the next administrative board meeting.

The final assigned issue on the agenda is **Item 1419: Vegetation Management Program**. Mr. Allen requested that this issue is carried over into the next ad hoc meeting when he should have information to share with the members.

There were no miscellaneous items. The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for May 8, 2007

Jean Baccus, Assistant Manager of Operations

(jc)

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

May 8, 2007

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. Robert Allen	City of LA -DWP (teleconference)
Mr. Justin Casher	Verizon California (teleconference)
Ms. Velma Prouty	AT&T California
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS (teleconference)
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	Cingular Wireless
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff

The members reviewed the minutes, and approved the minutes as written.

Mr. Chow requested that **Items 1341: Storm Costs, and 1360: Crane Costs**, be tabled until the next ad hoc committee meeting.

The members then discussed **Item 1361: Removal of Vegetation**. Mr. Chow stated his proposed revisions. He added that he would like to change AC item 13.B (All other by Special Agreement Section 1.2) to 13.C, and change 13.B to read, "Removal of vegetation" with an associated cost. He stated that he would research the cost of the revised AC item 13.B, since the \$200.00 originally proposed is over three years old.

Mr. Allen stated that he would like to combine **Item 1419: Vegetation Management Program** in with item 1361. Ms. Prescott inquired if all members maintain a vegetation management program. Mr. Chow responded that all electric utilities have vegetation management programs. He added that in Oregon, the precedent had been set where all joint members share in the cost of vegetation management; however, this would warrant extensive discussion within the committee.

Mr. Allen stated he has pictures of poles where the vegetation is so overgrown that it must be removed prior to changing out a pole. He added

that the cost for vegetation management could be shared, given a reasonable cost.

It was agreed that the two items remain separate.

Ms. Hernandez inquired on proposed item 13.C, "all other", as to what this statement represents. Mr. Chow responded that he has witnessed chain link fences among other things obstructing pole access. Ms. Hernandez suggested revising the verbiage to read, "other than vegetation". Mr. Chow disagreed stating that this verbiage would remove the flexibility for different types of obstruction. Mr. Allen agreed that the flexibility is necessary.

The consensus is that the ad hoc would agree on a cost for item 13.B.

Next on the agenda is **Item 1366: Review Anchor, Overhead and Down Guys**. It was agreed to use the costs originally proposed by Mr. Dennis Walls of DWP.

The members discussed several case scenarios extensively. The consensus is to place the proposed revisions on the discussion calendar of the May 16, 2007 Administrative Board meeting (see attachment for proposed revisions to AC Item 111-Anchors).

The final assigned issue on the agenda is **Item 1419: Vegetation Management Program**. Since this was discussed earlier, Mr. Allen requested that this issue be carried over into the next ad hoc meeting.

There were no miscellaneous items. The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 10:10 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for June 12, 2007

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

Item 1366: Review Anchor, Overhead and Down Guys

Current:

111. Anchors:

(a)	Expanding Plate (Hand Dig).....	962
(b)	Expanding Plate (Truck Access).....	519
(c)	PISA (Screw Anchor).....	423
(d)	Hydraulically Driven (Mantaray).....	415
(e)	Concreting an anchor.....	171
(f)	Sale of abandoned anchor to another utility – all sizes.....	80

NOTE: Actual size of anchor needs to be noted on JPA along with the appropriate item number for type. For existing anchors of an unknown type, use Item 111b. (The SCJPC recommends using a standard 1¼” anchor in all instances).

Proposed:

111. Anchors:

(a)	Expanding Plate (Hand Dig).....	962
(b)	Expanding Plate (Truck Access).....	519
(c)	PISA (Screw Anchor).....	423
(d)	Hydraulically Driven (Mantaray).....	415
(e)	Concreting an anchor.....	171
(f)	Sale of abandoned anchor to another utility – all sizes.....	80
(G)	<i>Existing Anchor Purchase (Rear property).....</i>	<i>673</i>
(h)	<i>Existing Anchor Purchase (Street/alley).....</i>	<i>363</i>

NOTE: Actual size of anchor needs to be noted on JPA along with the appropriate item number for type. For existing anchors of an unknown type, use Item 111b. (The SCJPC recommends using a standard 1¼” anchor in all instances).

NOTE: items 111 (g), and (h) are calculated at 70% of Item 111 (a) and (b) respectively.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

June 12, 2007

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:

Mr. Robert Allen	City of LA -DWP (teleconference)
Mr. Steven Rodriguez	T-Mobile USA
Ms. Velma Prouty	AT&T Calif. (teleconference)
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Ms. Kourtney Aboudara	NextG Networks
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	Cingular Wireless
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff

Mr. Allen opened the meeting by addressing the first item on the agenda.

Mr. Chow reported that in reference to **Item 1341: Storm Costs**, he is in the process of researching the original proposed cost of \$2,078.00, which was brought to the table by his predecessor. He requested to table this item. He added that he is attempting to coordinate with the heavy transportation department within his organization to schedule a presentation; therefore, he requested that **Item 1360: Crane Costs** be tabled as well.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1361: Removal of Vegetation**. At the prior meeting, members agreed to obtain the cost for removal of vegetation from within their organization for the current meeting. The members have not completed their research, but agreed to bring their associated costs to the next meeting.

Mr. Chow stated that the cost is for removal of vegetation in the instances for placement/replacement of a pole. He stated that it does not necessarily have to be on the pole, but anything even adjacent to the pole. He added anything that would impede the placement/replacement of a pole.

The members discussed the types of vegetation that they have witnessed obstructing the poles in the field. Mr. Chow stated that he has witnessed oleander out of control that was obstructing access to the pole.

Mr. Allen added that he also has witnessed a bougainvillea overgrown around a pole.

The consensus is to arrive at a reasonable, and equitable average cost for this issue.

Item 1419: Vegetation Management Program is the last issue on the agenda. Mr. Allen requested this item tabled for the next meeting.

Ms. Haney returned to the discussion of **Item 1361: Removal of Vegetation**. She stated that Mr. Chow stated earlier that there would be instances concerning this item, when Section 1.2 would be required. She added if the committee agrees on an average cost, at what point in the cost would this item require Section 1.2. She stated that in her opinion, she anticipates member's disputes concerning this authorized cost. Mr. Brown added that an outline for the scope of this item might be necessary.

Ms. Hernandez stated that when the members agree on a cost, that is the pre-agreed cost. However, when an action is not in the Routine Handbook, this action then reverts to Section 1.2.

Ms. Haney responded that members should be clear on what is, or is not included in AC item 13.B.

The members agreed that tree obstruction could be an exception. The term vegetation normally suggests ivy, and other shrubs.

Mr. Chow agreed and stated that the original proposal pertained primarily to ivy and other shrubs. Trees would certainly be an exception, since such costs are relatively greater.

Ms. Haney stated that she is of the opinion that it would be beneficial to state in the Routine the exception of tree removal versus vegetation removal.

Mr. Chow stated that once the ad hoc arrives at an agreed upon cost, then the Routine Handbook verbiage could be created for clarification.

There were no miscellaneous items discussed.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 9:40 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for July 10, 2007.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

August 7, 2007

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 11:30 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Robert Allen	City of LA -DWP (teleconference)
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena
Ms. Velma Prouty	AT&T Calif.
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS
Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Ms. Kourtney Aboudara	NextG Networks
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff

Mr. Allen opened the meeting by addressing the first item on the agenda, **Item 1341: Storm Costs**.

Mr. Chow stated that in reference to this item, since this issue was brought to the table so long ago, there have been many changes. He added that the numbers, and issue would require further investigating; therefore, he is proposing that this item be closed at this time. He stated that if needed, a new item number could be assigned to further address and/or make a proposal on this issue. This item is now closed.

The second issue on the agenda is **Item 1360: Crane Costs**. Mr. Chow reported that he would like this issue to remain open. He added that he would like to discuss with the members the criteria for utilizing a crane, and when it is applicable. SCE intends to facilitate a presentation for the members by their heavy transportation department. This could also include the utilizing of helicopters as well.

Ms. Prouty inquired if joint members have the option to apply section 1.2 if deemed a crane is, or is not necessary.

Mr. Chow responded if the members could arrive at an agreed upon authorized cost for crane use, than there would be no need for section 1.2. He added that the process for handling setting a pole in the same hole has a pre-agreed upon cost, then this concept could be applied to the usage of a crane. He stated that in his opinion, having a pre-agreed upon authorized cost for action items results in a greater efficient JPA process.

He stated that in instances when section 1.2 is applied, joint members request a copy of SCE invoices. Mr. Chow further stated that SCE is bond to

their vendors not to disclose any proprietary costs to outside parties, due to the nature of competition among vendors, and SCE utilizes several vendors. Therefore, if the ad hoc arrives at an agreed cost, resulting from the submitted costs from the joint members, this would result in joint members being aware of the crane costs immediately.

Ms. Prouty added that with section 1.2, the joint members must agree upon the cost initially, therefore, there should be no question what the cost would be on the final bill.

Mr. Chow responded that in some instances the agreed upon cost in the field may differ from the final bill from the vendor since SCE utilizes many vendors.

Mr. Cox inquired approximately how many crane vendors does SCE utilize. Mr. Chow responded that there could be at least five different vendors, which work within five different SCE zones.

Mr. Cox inquired if SCE is aware and/or familiar with the costs of the particular vendor that works within a specified zone. If SCE is aware of the costs, then they should be able to notate the cost on the JPA initially.

Ms. Prouty agreed and stated that SCE should be aware of what the cost of a crane would be if SCE uses different vendors for different zones at the time of the field meet.

Mr. Cox stated that since SCE utilizes five different vendors, who have an approximate difference of \$200.00, SCE could take an average of the costs to notate what the cost would be at the time of the field meet and special agreement.

Mr. Chow responded that the goal of SCE is to arrive at a cost, preferably an authorized cost. He stated that some members require a flat rate, and some members require it in hourly increments. He added that there is no consistency in the action of crane costs.

Ms. Prouty inquired if both members require the use of a crane, should the cost be omitted from the JPA since it is a mutual benefit.

Mr. Chow responded that with everything that is entailed in setting a pole with a crane, especially on a property line, it would not be labor effective to have the telco remove the old pole at a later time. There are many issues to be addressed when using a crane.

Mr. Chow stated that everyone's concerns would be addressed at the time of the presentation by the SCE heavy transportation department. All questions, and concerns would be answered.

Ms. Prouty stated that she would inquire with the engineers of her organization in regards to crane costs and any issues.

Mr. Chow stated that there is a heavy equipment presentation ready, however, he is unable to set the date at this time. He added that he would attempt to set a date as soon as possible.

The next issue on the agenda is **Item 1361: Removal of Vegetation**. Mr. Chow stated that the ad hoc members were to provide their respective costs for removal of vegetation. He inquired if any members have submitted

their costs. He proposed notifying the ad hoc members to have their costs for removal of vegetation by the September 11, 2007 ad hoc meeting.

Ms. Prouty inquired if the \$200.00 proposed cost is valid today.

Mr. Chow responded that he would verify the proposed cost within his organization.

Item 1419: Vegetation Management Program is the last issue on the agenda. Mr. Allen requested this item tabled for the next meeting.

The last issue on the agenda is **Item 1442: 2008 Pole Prices**. Ms. Corella reported that she took the liberty of assigning a number to this issue, since we are approaching the end of the third quarter. She added that she would be sending the pole price matrix, and the definition of elements to the members by the end of this week. It was agreed that the cut-off final date for submission of member's pole costs would be September 28, 2007.

There were no miscellaneous items discussed.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for September 11, 2007.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone (909) 592-4001
Fax (909) 592-4636

September 11, 2007

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 12:20 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Robert Allen	City of LA -DWP (teleconference)
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena
Mr. Justin Cashmer	Verizon California
Mr. Daniel Riggs	Verizon California
Ms. Velma Prouty	AT&T Calif.
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Wayne Brown	Southern California Edison
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS
Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Ms. Kourtney Aboudara	NextG Networks
Mr. Steve Rodriguez	T-Mobile USA
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff

Mr. Allen opened the meeting by addressing the first item on the agenda, **Item 1361: Removal of Vegetation**. He inquired if the ad hoc members had arrived at their respective costs for this item. Ms. Hernandez responded that AT&T Wireless agrees with the proposed cost of \$200.00. Mr. Chow stated that after inquiring within Southern California Edison it appears that currently, the proposed cost is in line with what is transacting today. Mr. Allen stated that after inquiry, the City of Los Angeles (DWP) is in agreement with the proposed costs.

Mr. Cashmer stated that Verizon California has not arrived at a cost at this time. He would have a cost for the members at the next ad hoc meeting.

Mr. Cox stated that the City of Pasadena also agrees with the proposed cost of \$200.00.

Ms. Prouty stated that she would submit her costs as Verizon California, at the next ad hoc meeting.

Mr. Rodriguez inquired if the ad hoc has identified what vegetation entails. Mr. Chow responded that vegetation should be defined in the handbook. He added that this would be any vegetation impacting or

obstructing the support structure that would prohibit pole replacement, climbing, or ground line restoration. Mr. Chow added that he would create a definition by the next meeting, and have the members review it for approval.

Mr. Rodriguez inquired if this would include tree trimming. Mr. Chow responded that it would not include tree trimming, since tree trimming requirements for power utilities differ from that of communication. Tree trimming could require Section 1.2, since this section is utilized with hazardous tree removal.

The consensus is to table this item pending on the submitted costs from Verizon California, and AT&T California. Mr. Chow would also have created the verbiage/definition associated with this cost.

The next issue is **Item 1419: Vegetation Management Program**. Mr. Allen brought this issue to the table, and he proposed closing it at this time. The consensus is to close this issue at this time.

The third issue is **Item 1442: 2008 Pole Prices**. Mr. Allen inquired how many members have submitted their costs to date. Ms. Corella responded that approximately 5 members have submitted their costs. The deadline for submitting pole costs is September 28, 2007.

On miscellaneous items, authorized costs 5(c) was brought to the table by SCE. Mr. Chow stated that the item states, "based on 2 cuts, topping and lowering". He added that this is probably based on labor only, however, today due to the disposal costs and the hazardous nature of poles, the cost of the disposing of poles has risen. He stated that disposal is addressed in 5(d), however, this item does not address the member that does the topping of the pole. This member must dispose of the excess pole portion. Therefore, Mr. Chow is proposing an additional cost for the hazardous disposal of the cut portion of the pole. He stated that he does not have a proposed cost at this time. He inquired if disposal costs are per foot or per pound.

Mr. Chow and Mr. Allen will research the disposal costs for pole portions, and ascertain if the cost is based on per pound or per foot.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for October 9, 2007.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

October 09, 2007

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 11:20 a.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Rick Freyre	City of LA -DWP (teleconference)
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena
Ms. Velma Prouty	AT&T Calif.
Mr. Larry Chow	Southern California Edison
Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS
Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff

Mr. Freyre opened the meeting by addressing the first item on the agenda, **Item 1361: Removal of Vegetation**. Mr. Chow reported that he did not have the verbiage and/or definition of the term vegetation. However, he stated that in regards to SCE, the vegetation they are referring to is that which deals with joint pole work. That is vegetation removal involving the facilitation of placement or replacement of a pole.

The SCE proposed cost for this item is \$200.00. Ms. Prouty stated that AT&T California would support the proposed \$200.00 cost. Mr. Chow added that SCE verified if the original proposal of \$200.00 is valid in today's market, and he reported that it remains a valid cost.

Mr. Hernandez stated that DWP is in agreement with the cost; however, Verizon California would like the time to research if they were in agreement with the proposed cost.

This item is to remain open pending on the Verizon California response. Verizon California was not present at this ad hoc meeting.

The second issue is **Item 1442: 2008 Pole Prices**. Mr. Freyre inquired how many members have submitted their pole costs. Ms. Corella distributed the worksheets for those members who have submitted their pole costs. The members who have submitted their costs are: T-Mobile, Edison, City of

Lompoc, Golden State Water, AT&T Wireless, Verizon California, AT&T California, City of Pasadena, and City of Anaheim.

Ms. Thomas requested an extension on behalf of Sprint PCS, AT&T Communications, and AT&T Local Services.

The members discussed an extension to all members, and agreed on the date of November 5, 2007 as the final cut-off date for submitting of pole prices.

Ms. Corella reported that of the costs submitted, there is only one member who chooses to be included in the weighted average. All other members have chosen to have their costs published individually.

Ms. Pranata stated that since so many members are opting to have their individual costs published, she is concerned with the format for the individual costs, and how they would be viewed on the SCJPC web page. The members briefly discussed formatting the costs, and the consensus is for Ms. Pranata to arrive at a format that is user friendly. Ms. Pranata stated that she would work on several formats and present them to the members at the next ad hoc meeting.

The final pole costs would be discussed at the next ad hoc meeting.

Under miscellaneous items AC 5-C disposal costs were discussed. Mr. Chow opened discussion by stating that when a member cuts a pole, they are only reimbursed for the cut, but not for the disposal of the piece of pole. Today, due to the hazardous nature of the poles, there is an additional hazardous waste disposal cost, based on foot or pound. Therefore, in his opinion, there should be an additional cost recovery for this issue.

Mr. Cox stated that the disposal costs for the City of Pasadena is based on poundage. The cost is \$63.00 per ton. Mr. Chow stated that he would research the current disposal costs for pole portions.

This item would remain open for further discussion.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for November 13, 2007.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA JOINT POLE COMMITTEE

437 So. Cataract Ave. Unit 3

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 592-4001

Fax (909) 592-4636

November 13, 2007

A meeting of the **ad hoc Committee on Authorized Cost Elements** took place on the above date, at 12:45 p.m., at the Committee office. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Robert Allen	City of LA -DWP (teleconference)
Mr. Sheldon Cox	City of Pasadena
Ms. Velma Prouty	AT&T Calif.
Ms. Sherri Goetz	Southern California Edison
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	AT&T Wireless
Ms. Sue Thomas	Sprint PCS
Mr. Cory Autrey	Sprint-Nextel
Ms. Paula Haney	NextG Networks
Mr. Malcolm Brown	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Jennie Corella	Committee Staff
Ms. Jean Baccus	Committee Staff

Mr. Allen opened the meeting by addressing the first item on the agenda, **Item 1361: Removal of Vegetation**. Southern California Edison is proposing a \$200.00 authorized costs for this transaction (see attachment). All ad hoc members are in agreement with the cost, with the exception of Verizon California. Verizon California did not have any information to share with the members at this time. Therefore, the consensus is to bring this issue to the administrative board meeting of November 28, 2007 to be placed on the discussion calendar.

The second issue is **Item 1442: 2008 Pole Prices**. Ms. Corella reported that the final dead line for submitting costs was November 5, 2007. Ms. Prescott noted a problem with the calculations of the numbers on the weighted average spreadsheet.

Mr. Allen reviewed the prices submitted by DWP and noted an error in the costs. He stated that the costs were compiled by Mr. Freyre, and Mr. Walls and would contact them to ascertain how they arrived at the submitted costs.

Ms. Corella reworked the spreadsheet for the weighted average. She stated that her summations were incorrect.

After conferring with Mr. Freyre, and Mr. Walls, Mr. Allen will re-submit his costs prior to November 21, 2008 to ensure that they are ready for the November board meeting.

The consensus is to place Item 1442: 2008 Pole Prices on the discussion calendar of the November 28, 2007 board meeting.

Under miscellaneous items are listed item AC 5-C disposal cost, which was brought to the table by SCE. Edison was not ready for discussion on this issue at this time. Mr. Allen added that the City of Los Angeles was not ready either. It was agreed to table this issue for the next meeting. This item would remain open for further discussion.

The ad hoc meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for January 2008.

Jennie Corella, Manager of Operations

Attachment

Ad Hoc Committee on Authorized Costs.

Item 1361 Removal of Vegetation

- 13. Pole access obstructions:
 - (a) Clearing poles in State Responsibility Area.
16
(Includes cost of contractor to perform activity and post Quality Control inspection)
 - (b) Removal of vegetation to facilitate the placement/replacement of a pole.
200
 - (c) All other by Special Agreement Section 1.2