

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone (909) 599-3801
Fax (909) 599-3825

February 19, 2025

A meeting of the **ad hoc Authorized Cost Elements Committee** took place on the above date, at 11:24 a.m. via teleconference. **Those in attendance were:**

Mr. Nick Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Silvana Ray	Southern California Edison
Ms. Marisol Bailey	Southern California Edison
Mr. Michael Pearson	Southern California Edison
Ms. Shelby Mulvehill	Southern California Edison
Ms. Carla Stephen	Southern California Edison
Mr. Cesar Rodriguez	Southern California Edison
Mr. Kristoffer Scheetz	Southern California Edison
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Robert Stanard	AT&T California
Mr. Alvin Robielos	AT&T California
Ms. Joy Young	AT&T California
Ms. Megan LaMon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Jeremy Effinger	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Jeremy Harmon	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Alex Parra	City of Riverside
Mr. John Vu	City of Anaheim
Ms. Maria Ortiz	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications/XO Communications
Mr. Irvin Orzuna	City of Glendale
Mr. Salvador Zambrano	City of Burbank
Mr. Joe Armstrong	City of Pasadena
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time-Warner Cable
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc.
Mr. Phillip Hinojos	City of Colton
Ms. Nicole Munoz	City of Colton
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Mr. David Campo	City of Lompoc
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel/Sprint Communications
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Ms. Linda McLean	Extenet Systems
Ms. Heidi Seropian	Extenet Systems

Ms. Tamara Zaki
Ms. Patti Ringo
Ms. Angela Pranata
Ms. Kathleen Allen

Boldyn Networks US LLC
Sonic Telecom, LLC
Committee Staff
Committee Staff

Mr. Van Stryk called the meeting to order at 11:24 a.m.

Agenda Item 1 - Review of prior month's minutes

Mr. Van Stryk opened the meeting by asking if there were any questions or concerns regarding the previous meeting minutes. No members commented or expressed concerns.

Agenda Items 2 - Review of Pole Prices

- Review of submitted 2025 Pole Prices.

Mr. Van Stryk moved on to the discussion of pole prices, reminding all members that this topic had been moved to the Admin Board's discussion calendar. He emphasized that all members should have the opportunity to review the prices in advance of the vote, which would take place at the following month's meeting.

Ms. Pranata informed the members that the weighted average pole prices had changed. She confirmed that AT&T California would now be included in the weighted average prices rather than publishing its individual costs. Mr. Van Stryk inquired whether Pasadena had responded to the matter, and Ms. Pranata confirmed that Pasadena had agreed to use the previous year's costs, which would also be incorporated into the updated individual prices.

Ms. Pranata noted that due to her absence from the office, she had not yet had the opportunity to update the weighted average. However, she committed to making the necessary adjustments and sending the revised pricing information to all members via email.

Agenda Item 3 – Review of Authorized Costs

- Review of submitted 2025-2026 Authorized Costs.

Mr. Van Stryk stated that this item could be closed for now since the Administrative Board had approved it earlier that day.

Agenda Item 4 – Miscellaneous/New Item Numbers

Standardization of Cost Calculations

Ms. Black introduced the topic of standardizing the process for calculating pole prices. She expressed concern over discrepancies in time calculations for tasks such as pole placement, citing that different utilities may report

significantly differing time requirements (e.g., one utility may state that it takes 20 hours to place a new pole, while another reports only 4 hours). Ms. Black proposed creating guidelines or standards for calculating these costs to ensure greater consistency and mutual understanding.

Mr. Van Stryk expressed reservations about attempting to standardize the operational practices of individual utilities, particularly in terms of crew size or equipment requirements, which may vary depending on the utility's specific needs or union requirements. The major differences are most likely between power and communication companies. He emphasized the importance of respecting each utility's operational flexibility while acknowledging that significant disparities in calculations should be addressed.

Ms. Black agreed that nobody should be telling another utility how to do their work. However, she added that there should be some general guidelines or definitions to ensure that mutually agreed-upon beneficial tasks (e.g., the installation and removal of poles) are appropriately priced. The members discussed the possibility of using a weighted philosophy in cost calculations to provide a more balanced approach.

Mr. Van Stryk inquired whether the standardized calculation was intended for the authorized cost packet or pole prices. Ms. Black responded that she thought the members should review both. Her concern centered on the incorrect inclusion of all hours associated with pole replacement in cost calculations, rather than isolating only those hours that were mutually beneficial (i.e., the labor for placing a new pole and removing the old pole). Ms. Black wanted to ensure that cost-sharing calculations reflect only the mutually beneficial aspects of the work.

Mr. Van Stryk affirmed that, as currently written, the calculations should only include the cost of specific actions rather than an entire pole replacement divided among all involved parties. Ms. Black agreed.

Mr. Van Stryk proposed a review of the current cost calculation methodology to create or update the relevant documentation and circulate a revised explanation.

Mr. Harmon emphasized that this discussion should remain within the JPC format, in JPC meetings, so all members could contribute to refining cost-sharing methodologies.

Mr. Van Stryk proposed that the members draft a revised document to better explain the cost calculation methodology, incorporating clear definitions and examples.

He suggested creating two new item numbers for this purpose:

- Item 1801: Review of pole price calculations.
- Item 1802: Authorized cost calculation document: Creating a new document explaining authorized cost calculations in detail, including examples for clarity.

Shared Costs for Tree Trimming and Joint Space

Mr. Van Stryk mentioned a possible shared cost for tree trimming and a shared cost for inspections; however, these discussions may first take place in other meetings before being brought back to the Authorized Costs Committee meeting.

Ms. Black suggested adding a new item number to address climbing space as a shared cost. She mentioned that it could be a quick edit and proposed using item 13B with the words “climbing space” added.

Mr. Harmon proposed an amendment to Section 14.7, clarifying that tree trimming necessary for the mutual benefit of all parties should be subject to shared cost. He suggested rewording the provision to include climbing space, ensuring all members contribute fairly to maintenance costs for mutually beneficial climbing space.

Mr. Van Stryk noted a potential conflict with existing language that currently states shared tree trimming “shall not be a joint expense except where all members agree.” He expressed concern that such language might require full agreement under 1.2, similar to how traffic control is handled.

After further discussion, it was agreed to create a new item number (Item 1803) for reviewing authorized costs related to tree trimming for jointly owned space. This item would be developed in parallel with other discussions regarding routine revisions.

Mr. Van Stryk asked if there were any other miscellaneous items. There were no questions or comments.

Agenda Item 5 - Review of Action Items:

- Ms. Pranata will send the updated pole prices – These will include changes from AT&T California and Pasadena, to be reviewed and voted on at the next Admin Board meeting in March 2025.
- Three new item numbers were added:
 - Item 1801: Review of pole price calculations.
 - Item 1802: Review of authorized cost calculations. A new Word document will be created, and examples will be added to clarify how authorized costs should be calculated for consistency.
 - Item 1803: Review of authorized tree trimming costs for jointly owned space. This item will be developed in parallel with other discussions regarding routine revisions.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for March 19, 2025.

Transcribed by Angela Pranata – Committee Staff