

**Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

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

August 20, 2025

A meeting of the **ad hoc Authorized Cost Elements Committee** took place on the above date, at 12:17 p.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Nick Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Ms. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Jacqueline Costa	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Jeremy Effinger	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Gabriel Pech	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Ms. Silvana Ray	Southern California Edison
Ms. April DeBarge	Southern California Edison
Ms. Carla Stephen	Southern California Edison
Ms. Shelby Mulvehill	Southern California Edison
Ms. Marisol Bailey	Southern California Edison
Mr. Micheal Pearson	Southern California Edison
Mr. Samuel Picazo	Southern California Edison
Mr. Kevin Flores	Southern California Edison
Mr. Todd Dailey	AT&T California
Mr. Julian Ruiz	AT&T California
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Aaron Cochran	AT&T California
Mr. Alvin Robielos	AT&T California
Ms. Joy Young	AT&T California
Ms. Veronica Casanova	AT&T California
Mr. Alex Parra	City of Riverside
Mr. Irvin Orzuna	City of Glendale
Mr. Edward Khashadourian	City of Glendale
Ms. Maria Ortiz	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications/XO Communications
Ms. Katia Muradian	City of Pasadena
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc.
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. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff

Mr. Van Stryk called the meeting to order at **12:17 p.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 month’s meeting minutes. No members commented or expressed any concerns.

**Agenda Item 2 – Item 1800: Approved Maintenance Program Review (K. Black, AT&T California – 2/19/2025)**

Mr. Van Stryk turned the discussion over to Ms. Black. Ms. Black stated that the item had already been reviewed during the Routine Revision Committee meeting and apologized for the redundancy. She clarified that the review occurred in the Routine Revision Committee and involved combining and revising the verbiage for the listed items. Ms. Pranata asked whether future discussions of this item should be centralized within a single committee or continue to appear on three separate agendas. Ms. Black responded by proposing the removal of the item from both the Compliance and Authorized Costs agendas, stating that it was better suited for the Routine Revision Committee. Mr. Van Stryk agreed with the suggestion and asked whether the item might return to the Authorized Costs Committee in the future. Ms. Black confirmed that the item would remain on the Routine Revision Committee's agenda. The item will be removed from the Authorized Costs agenda.

**Agenda Item 3 – Item 1801: Review of Pole Price Calculations (K. Black, AT&T California - 2/19/2025)**

Mr. Van Stryk turned the discussion over to Ms. Black. Ms. Black shared her screen to display the proposed pole price instructions and confirmed that she had received no edits or feedback on the proposed instructions. She reminded the committee that a decision had been made in the previous meeting to revert to using loaded labor rates, which would be reflected in the next version of the document she would distribute.

Ms. Black stated that she intended to discuss three specific items during the meeting and sought consensus on average values to be used. She began with the topic of planning and engineering time, referencing a spreadsheet created by AT&T CA containing data from the 2025 pole prices analysis, specifically column nine (Engineering and Planning). The data showed that all members had reported approximately one hour for engineering and planning tasks. Based on this, Ms. Black proposed using one hour of loaded labor rate, averaging approximately \$270 based on 2025 pricing. She invited comments, asking whether any member believed their company required more than one hour to perform pole loading calculations, regardless of pole size. No objections were raised, and the committee agreed to the one-hour standard.

Ms. McLean asked whether the one-hour estimate included fielding and site surveys. Ms. Black responded that the guidance had not changed from previous instructions and confirmed that site surveys, pole loading calculations, and JPA documentation were included in the estimate.

Ms. Black then moved on to the topic of transport and handling, explaining that this category referred to the time required to move a pole from the yard to a pole dolly, transport it to the site, and return to the yard.

Ms. Black presented average times based on pole size:

- For poles between 25 and 50 feet, the average was 4.00 hours.
- For poles between 60 and 75 feet, the average was 4.33 hours.
- For poles between 80 and 110 feet, the average was 4.56 hours.

Ms. Black stated that she would send the data to all members for internal review and requested feedback to reach a consensus on standardized averages. She emphasized that the goal was to establish uniform values for all members to use, simplifying the calculation process.

Ms. Black then addressed the topic of digging and erecting poles, noting that some companies had misunderstood what was being asked. She clarified that the time should include only digging the hole, erecting the pole, plumbing, backfilling, and compacting. She suggested that discrepancies may have arisen from misunderstandings about the included tasks and noted significant variation in reported times, ranging from 4 to 20 hours.

Ms. Black asked members with field experience to provide input on how long the digging and erecting process should take and whether pole height affected the time required. She specifically invited Mr. Bacon and Mr. Van Stryk to share their insights.

Mr. Van Stryk responded that the time required depended on several factors, including the accuracy of dig alerts, soil type, depth and width of the hole, and the increasing width of poles. Ms. Black acknowledged that these factors indicated a need for different time estimates based on pole height and class. She reiterated that tasks such as breaking concrete or fitting into existing holes should not be included, as they were covered by separate authorized costs.

Ms. Black proposed sending the item back to members for further review and suggested that each pole height might require a unique time estimate. She also speculated that the number of workers required might vary with pole height, noting that taller poles might necessitate more personnel.

Mr. Van Stryk commented that while the number of workers for digging and erecting might be limited by physical space around the hole, transport tasks could require more personnel. He elaborated on the complexity of transport, noting that a 25-foot pole on a dolly was significantly easier to handle than a 50- or 55-foot pole. He suggested redefining the height ranges to better align with practical experience:

- 25 to 40 feet
- 45 to 65 feet
- 70 to 85 feet
- 90 to 110 feet

Ms. Black stated that she would revise the spreadsheet accordingly and distribute it for further review. She confirmed that no members had contacted her to suggest additional items for inclusion in the pole price calculations, aside from the cost of the pole itself, which would be addressed separately.

Ms. Black concluded the discussion by asking whether there were any questions regarding the homework assignment she would send out. Hearing none, she introduced the final topic: verification of cost data.

Ms. Black revisited a discussion from the previous meeting regarding the need to “trust but verify” cost data submitted by members. She acknowledged concerns about confidentiality and legal limitations and proposed a new approach. She suggested that each member submit their cost documentation directly to Ms. Pranata, who would verify the data privately. Ms. Pranata would confirm that the documentation matched the submitted spreadsheet values, and no other members would have access to the data.

Mr. Van Stryk expressed uncertainty about the proposal, noting that the verification process might not differ significantly from current practices and that he was unsure about what kind of information Ms. Black would like Ms. Pranata to review. Ms. Ray agreed with Mr. Van Stryk’s comment. Ms. Black clarified that the process would involve submitting screenshots of procurement costs for specific pole sizes, which Ms. Pranata would compare against spreadsheet entries. She explained that AT&T CA would volunteer to test the process and provide an example for other members.

Mr. Van Stryk stated that material costs would be easy to share and speculated that members might be interested in seeing each other’s procurement sources. Ms. Black emphasized that the verification would be limited to Ms. Pranata to maintain confidentiality and reiterated that the process was intended to ensure transparency and accountability.

Ms. Black asked whether there were any further questions. Hearing none, she thanked the committee and stated that she would distribute the revised documents as soon as possible for internal review.

#### **Agenda Item 4 – Item 1802: Review of Authorized Cost Calculations (2/19/2025) – ON HOLD**

This item was placed on hold until further discussions on pole prices are completed.

#### **Agenda Items 5 - Review of Pole Prices (Yearly – Standing Agenda/Placeholder)**

The committee will reopen this item in September 2025. Ms. Pranata asked whether she needed to take any action regarding pole prices for the upcoming September meeting. Mr. Van Stryk responded that she could send out the Word document and the Excel spreadsheet. He added that the committee could review them in conjunction with Item 1801, but anticipated that the 2026 pole prices would continue to be handled using the existing method, while Ms. Black’s suggestions were under review.

Mr. Van Stryk concluded that the committee was not yet ready to adopt new methods (Item 1801).

#### **Agenda Item 6 - Review of Authorized Costs (Every two years – Standing Agenda/Placeholder)**

The committee will reopen this item in September 2026.

**Agenda Item 7 – Miscellaneous / New Item Numbers**

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

**Agenda Item 8 – Review of Action Items**

- Item 1800 has been closed.
- Item 1801: Members to review the documents from Ms. Black.

The meeting adjourned at 12:37 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for September 17, 2025.

Transcribed by Angela Pranata – Committee Staff

# Item 1800 - Maintenance Authorized Cost Items

Edits are red –

## 12. Pole **Intrusive** Inspections and Treatment (Only one item number per test.)

(a) Reserved for future use	
(b) Partial Dig	261
(c) Sound and Bore -	261
(d) Full Treatment	261
(e) Reject -	261

~~Note: May only be billed once every 5 years (Effective May 2014).~~

- a. Poles Excavated – Treated Reject, Full Excavation or Dug Reject – poles over 15 yrs
- b. Poles Not Excavated – Sound & Bore, Visual – poles over 15 yrs
- c. Poles Partially Excavated – Partial Excavate – poles over 15 yrs
- d. Poles Excavated – Treated Reject, Full Excavation or Dug Reject – poles w/pass 20 yrs ago
- e. Poles Not Excavated – Sound & Bore, Visual– poles w/pass 20 yrs ago
- f. Poles Partially Excavated – Partial Excavate– poles w/pass 20 yrs ago

~~(f,g)~~ Re-inspection of reinforced poles (may only be billed once every 10 years, effective 06/01/2011) .....417

## 15. Pole Marking – Maintenance items only (Revised 11/17/2021)

(a) Re-Tagging....only once per pole per 12 mos, unless special agreement.....	161
(b) Replacing Visibility Strips ..... only once per year, unless special agreement.....	163

## Item 1801-

### Simplified Definitions of Pole Price Elements

#### 1. Engineering and Planning Time –

- a. The AVERAGE amount of time (in hours and/or quarter-hour increments) directly related to doing a site survey, pole loading calculation and JPA document preparation for set/replacement of a jointly owned pole. (When calculating the amount of time, only include the portion of time that is directly related to design of just the joint pole replacement and not the part of the design which benefits just one owner.) Show in hours /or in 15 min increments.
- b. Engineering and Planning Hourly Direct Labor Rate (Loaded) Range in US dollars. - The hourly rate “range” paid to a field worker (or title) directly related to doing a site survey, pole loading calculation and JPA document preparation for set/replacement of a jointly owned pole. Listed “range” in US dollars to US dollars.
- c. Job title for the Engineering and Planning worker who will do site survey, pole loading and JPA document preparation? List job title.

#### 2. Transport & Handling Time –

- a. The AVERAGE amount of time (in hours and/or quarter-hour increments) directly related to workers loading a pole onto a pole dolly, transporting the pole to the job site and returning to the yard. (Do not include the time to place the pole in the ground or to do any other work on the pole.) Show in hours /or in 15 min increments under each pole height.

#### 3. Digging and Erecting Time-

- a. The AVERAGE amount of man-hours to excavate the pole hole, erect the pole, plumb the pole, backfill and compaction tamp the pole in place. This is the only portion of a new AVERAGE pole placement considered for mutual benefit. There should not be time included for work that is for the sole benefit of any member on record. (Does not include poles that require “additional” work due to terrain, soil type or actual pole location. Those poles would have Authorized Cost Item numbers added to the JPA to cover the additional costs.) Show in hours /or in 15 min increments under each pole height.
- b. Number of workers - The AVERAGE number of workers needed to perform the work involved with digging and erecting an AVERAGE placement of each specific pole height. Show the number of workers for each pole height.
- c. Hourly Direct Labor Rate (Loaded) Range in US dollars. - The hourly rate “range” paid to a field worker (or title) directly involved in digging and erecting the pole. List your Company's salary range in US dollars to US dollars.
- d. What is the job title for the field worker involved in digging and erecting a pole? List job title.

Authorized Cost – Item 1801 – K. Black-AT&T CA

**4. Pole Material Cost (F.O.B.) –**

- a. When a Utility sets only one pole class per pole height, use the actual cost from Supplier, in US dollars including sales tax and transportation costs from supplier) of a pole delivered to the first destination point (usually a purchaser's construction yard). If multiple pole classes are set for the same pole height, list the data for each class. The SCJPC will then "average" all the costs, for the prices used. Show in US dollars under each pole class and pole size.