

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

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

November 19, 2025

A meeting of the **ad hoc Computer Communications Committee** took place on the above date, at 11:16 a.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Silvana Ray	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. 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. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Robert Stanard	AT&T California
Ms. Joy Young	AT&T California
Mr. Alvin Robielos	AT&T California
Mr. Alex Parra	City of Riverside
Mr. Irvin Orzuna	City of Glendale
Ms. Maria Ortiz	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications/XO Communications
Mr. Salvador Zambrano	City of Burbank
Ms. Jacklin Ghaly	City of Pasadena
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc.
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel/Sprint Communications
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Ms. Linda McLean	Extenet Systems
Ms. Heidi Seropian	Extenet Systems
Ms. Patti Ringo	Sonic Telecom, LLC
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff

Ms. Ray called the meeting to order at **11:16 a.m.**

Agenda Item 1 – Review of prior month’s minutes

Ms. Ray opened the meeting by asking if there were any questions or concerns regarding last month’s meeting minutes. No members commented or expressed concerns.

Agenda Item 2 – Item 1806: Standardized Excel Form (6/18/2025 – moved from Operating Committee)

- Action item: Ms. Pranata to obtain quotes for programming services to automate Final Form processing and billing calculations.
- Quote is included in the meeting packet.

Ms. Ray inquired whether Ms. Pranata was able to obtain the quote. Ms. Pranata reported that a quote had been received, placed in the packet, and uploaded to the Agenda page on the site, stating that the proposed work would cost \$13,500. She explained that, consistent with the discussion held in the last meeting, she, Ms. Ray, and Mr. Treepaisan had met to brainstorm an incremental approach and agreed to structure the work in phases. In the initial phase (phase one), the programmer would build functionality to insert authorized cost values into the final Form 2 automatically. The phase-one scope explicitly set aside the more complex grade and space calculations, safety clearance zones, and other multi-party logic for later phases.

Ms. Ray inquired if the quoted amount covered only the initial phase (phase one) and did not include the subsequent phases. Ms. Pranata confirmed it would only include phase one and added that, in her earlier conversations with the vendor, it had been difficult to convey the method by which authorized costs are constructed, which contributed to limiting the scope to phase one for now. Ms. Black asked whether the quoted work would effectively shift responsibilities so the biller could rely on the automated insertion whenever an item number represents an authorized cost calculation. Ms. Pranata explained that the vision for phase one was a simple capability focused on authorized costs but emphasized that the quoted figure reflected an estimate for building the function and that testing would follow only after the tool was delivered. She also noted that this initial work would target a single version, the July 2020 Final Form 2 Excel file, so if a member submitted a different final version, the tool would not operate on it. Ms. Black asked if Edison is using that version, since Edison is the largest biller, which suggested the change would affect a substantial share of JPAs. Ms. Ray responded that Edison is now using the July 2020 Final Form 2. Ms. Black expressed support for the automation, noting that authorized cost calculation is a significant part of the billing workload. Ms. Ortiz also expressed support and noted there are numerous steps and details in calculating the authorized costs.

Ms. Pranata stated that the quote required a vote of the Administrative Board due to the amount. Because the committee does not meet in December 2025, she asked whether the committee preferred to discuss further or to place the matter on the January 2026 agenda for a vote. Ms. Black asked what would happen if the tool failed and whether funds would be recoverable. Mr. Treepaisan stated that companies usually incorporate user acceptance testing into the contract to ensure that the committee would only accept and pay for work deemed acceptable. Ms. Ray asked whether payment terms would be structured around milestones. Ms. Pranata stated that she discussed it verbally but will ask them to revise the terms to include a percentage that could be paid upfront, with the remainder upon completion.

Ms. Pranata explained that her team was continuing the work of converting authorized cost data into a clean Excel format for all years available on the website, since the data currently existed in a mix of PDF and Word documents. She believed that the current compilation would cover authorized costs from 2012 through 2025, and her team is working on entering older authorized costs into the clean Excel file for the programmer.

Mr. Van Stryk cited the proposal's allocation of ninety hours and raised the possibility that manual calculation of the authorized costs could, in some cases, be faster. Ms. LaFrenais commented that we are exploring this option to see if there is a way to complete the JPAs more efficiently.

Mr. Van Stryk asked to revisit the proposal and questioned whether the vendor's deliverable would be robust over time. He cautioned that if the approach depended on Excel cell locations and static structures, minor changes to the form in the future could break the tool, and he suggested the product might be a one-time solution rather than something enduring. Ms. LaFrenais responded that diligence upfront, both in design and review, would be essential and that, as with the committee's current systems, updates could be requested from the programmer if Excel Form 2 structures changed later. Ms. Ray asked Ms. Pranata to inquire how the vendor would treat enhancements and emphasized, based on lessons learned from prior efforts, the need to obtain the underlying code to prevent loss of continuity if the vendor later exited the business. Mr. Van Stryk anticipated that the solution might be delivered as a macro or VBA embedded within a file and that the SCJPC committee would own the code.

Mr. Van Stryk asked about the goal of the effort. Ms. Ray described the intent to increase efficiency through automation and reduce backlog. Mr. Treepaisan reflected that while building a tool requires substantial upfront effort, the payoffs would be realized in future efficiency gains. Mr. Treepaisan asked whether Mr. Van Stryk's concern was specifically the ninety-hour estimate or something else. Mr. Van Stryk clarified that his concern was about the tool's capacity to work on the current form and potential limitations that could make future changes to the form more expensive. Mr. Treepaisan agreed that the approach would likely be tailored to a specific form, with specific cells in required positions for the logic to operate. Ms. Pranata reiterated that any modification to the form in the future would necessitate returning to the programmer for code changes billed on an hourly basis.

The committee reviewed some examples of the Authorized Costs calculation on Form 2. She then explained that, in the envisioned workflow, the program would automatically insert prices for the item numbers (authorized costs) in the final JPA. Ms. LaFrenais commented that this could reduce errors and accelerate review. Mr. Van Stryk disagreed.

Mr. Van Stryk asked if the tool would only work for two-party JPAs. Ms. Pranata confirmed that she only demonstrated two-party calculation to the vendor because the logic for three or more parties is more complex. Ms. Ray suggested presenting the entire scope to the vendor, including multi-party scenarios, and placing the responsibility on the vendor to develop a solution.

Mr. Van Stryk stated that *Location and Nature of Work* entries often provide important context about which party is billing, which items are in dispute or agreed, and, for example, whether traffic control charges apply when multiple parties are present and one party has not agreed. He emphasized that such nuances frequently appear in free-form text and that the committee has historically relied on human judgment to interpret and apply them. To rely less on human judgment, the underlying process would need to be made more black-and-white, reducing gray areas and ambiguity. Mr. Treepaisan asked whether Mr. Van Stryk suggested that the committee should create tabling or mapping between authorized cost item numbers and the sections. Mr. Van Stryk noted that when only one other member is on a pole, item allocations can be straightforward, but as multiple parties are added, the logic of who pays for which item (for instance, whether a power company's communication space triggers particular charges) becomes more involved.

Ms. Black commented that the initiating member is responsible for populating the proposed side of the form correctly, and negotiations occurring at preliminary stages should be settled by then so that the math can be computed in a relatively straightforward manner on the Final Form 2. Ms. Pranata commented that the company declining to bid had explained that there were too many variables in how members typed sections, special

agreement prices, and related instructions under the *Location and Nature of Work* section, making reliable coding difficult without standardization.

Mr. Van Stryk commented that if the committee wants the tool to deliver the cost based on the item number and leave the billers to determine where the prices go, then he would be fine with it, rather than asking the tool to interpret instructions, divide costs among parties, and enter the prices into the Final Form 2. He added that any attempt to automate division among parties would introduce errors.

Ms. Black asked how much time the biller spent looking for the prices. She estimated that it would be a huge amount of time, so it would save billers a lot of time. Ms. Pranata stated that if the tool works and the rows that have item numbers have been filled out, then the billers would just skip them, but she was unsure how much time the billers would save.

After further discussion, the committee suggested to expand the scope of the project and provide the developers with examples of multi-party JPAs (3+).

Mr. Van Stryk raised an initial concern about whether the consultants or programmers involved fully understood the existing billing spreadsheets and proposed that, if they did understand the current functionality, they should be given an opportunity to redesign the spreadsheet so that it could better support multi-party JPAs.

Mr. Van Stryk commented that the programmers were likely attempting to implement this logic using VBA within Excel, which he felt could be limiting. He noted that there might be alternative approaches, though he acknowledged uncertainty about the tools being used. Mr. Treepaisan asked which programming languages Mr. Van Stryk would prefer if there were flexibility. Mr. Van Stryk explained that his background involved assembly, MATLAB, and some C, primarily for handling complex mathematical calculations, arrays, and matrices. He clarified that he was not accustomed to building highly complex conditional logic trees and expressed concern that excessive conditional branching could quickly become unmanageable.

Mr. Van Stryk illustrated this concern by explaining how conditional statements could balloon into highly complex trees when accounting for company names, years, item numbers, and small input variations. Mr. Treepaisan responded that many newer programmers favored Python, noting that Python could be used to scan PDFs or Excel files and replicate the same logic consistently across records. He reiterated that correct logic and standardized inputs were critical and that thorough upfront testing could address many of these issues.

Mr. Van Stryk added that uniformity was essential, pointing out that misspellings of company names or typos would cause the program to fail to recognize them. Ms. Pranata agreed and stated that such verification could be part of a broader system, noting that there were many variables involved. Mr. Treepaisan proposed that certain verification could be applied to Form 2 submissions and that many similarities across pole numbers and column structures could be leveraged to prevent overly complex conditional logic. He also suggested restricting allowable inputs through dropdowns or predefined fields to further minimize errors.

Ms. Pranata then explained a specific complication associated with JPAs involving three, four, or five parties, noting that additional pages, referred to as *second pages* such as Page 1A, 2A, 3A, etc., needed to be inserted into Final Form 2. She acknowledged that she was not a programmer and was unsure whether automation could accommodate this, which was why she had not described billing for JPAs with more than three parties in detail. Ms. Pranata elaborated that billing pages such as Pages 1A, 2A, or 3A were used depending on the number of parties involved. She reiterated her uncertainty about the feasibility of automating this process but believed it was theoretically possible. Mr. Van Stryk responded that these pages already existed and could simply be hidden or appended through

programming logic. He suggested that these pages could be placed after the final page and programmatically repositioned for printing purposes.

Ms. Pranata then remarked that another option would be for the committee to develop custom software, although she noted that attempts to do so had been ongoing since the 1990s without success. Mr. Bacon pointed out that Edison had successfully automated its processes and asked Edison to confirm. Ms. Ray responded that Edison used SAP, described it as a robust system, and stated that several members also used SAP for accounting. She questioned whether the committee would be open to adopting SAP or a similar system.

Mr. Treepaisan commented that with sufficient time and funding, the system could be rebuilt in SAP with fully online inputs, eliminating Form 2 submissions. Mr. Van Stryk agreed that full automation was possible but emphasized that it would be expensive. He suggested that even a simple input mechanism preventing incorrect entries would be valuable, noting that resolving returns and memos alone would significantly reduce workload and save time and money.

Ms. Ray asked whether other providers had been considered. Mr. Van Stryk recalled that a shared program had once been proposed that required all members to buy in, but the idea was abandoned after large members such as Edison and Crown Castle developed their own internal systems. Ms. Pranata added that staffing constraints made it difficult for members to operate two systems simultaneously. She referenced a previous proposal by Lynne Prescott, who had developed JPA software. Ms. Ortiz confirmed that Ms. Prescott had created a system called JPAssist. Mr. Van Stryk recalled using JPAssist and described it as useful, though Ms. Ortiz clarified that it was no longer in use and that it never advanced beyond preliminary JPA creation, stopping short of billing functionality. Ms. Pranata observed that if the preliminary stages were accurate and error-free, billing would naturally become much smoother.

Mr. Treepaisan then asked whether revisiting the input form itself should be added as an agenda item. Mr. Van Stryk suggested giving programmers the authority to change the input form to enforce greater uniformity, such as limiting one item number per line, standardizing year fields, and separating class, treatment, and percentage fields. He emphasized that such changes would significantly ease coding and reduce errors. Mr. Treepaisan agreed, stating that this would minimize inconsistent inputs.

Ms. Pranata concluded that the group would ask programmers for recommendations on revamping and redesigning the existing forms and would consider revisiting firms that had previously declined to bid. Ms. Pranata noted that any change would require agreement from all 31 members, and Mr. Van Stryk confirmed that universal adoption would be necessary for the system to work.

Ms. Pranata stated that she had identified her action item.

Agenda Item 3 - Miscellaneous items/New item numbers

Ms. Ray asked if there were any miscellaneous items. There were no questions or comments.

Agenda Item 4 - Review of Action Items

- Ms. Pranata to connect with the programmers to revamp and redesign existing forms for uniformity, accuracy, and reliability.

The meeting adjourned at 12:06 p.m. until January 21, 2026.



ACCURATE
DIGITAL SOLUTIONS

SCJPC

Prepared for:

Angela Pranata
SCJPC
San Dimas, CA

Created by:

Robert McCarthy
Accurate Digital Solutions
Sacramento, CA

Proposal: Excel File Automation Project

This proposal outlines the scope and estimated effort required to automate the process of updating Excel files using a client-supplied input file and a dataset/map directory. The objective is to streamline how target Excel files are updated with current price and bill code information, ensuring accuracy and efficiency.

Project Overview: Automate updating target Excel files using client-provided input and a mapping dataset.

Key Steps & Hour Estimates

Input & Data Retrieval

- **Input File Reader:** Script to extract file names & years from the client input file (2 hrs)
- **Retrieve Item Numbers:** Extend script to get item numbers from target files (3 hrs)
- **Dataset Analysis:** Review dataset file structure (2 hrs)
- **Dataset Reader:** Retrieve prices & bill codes for each item/year (2 hrs)

Matching & Validation

- **Data Matching Logic:** Match item numbers and years between files (5 hrs)
- **File Structure ID:** Identify target file columns/formats (6 hrs)
- **Column Validation:** Check column consistency & highlight errors (6 hrs)

Update & Output

- **Copy & Update Logic:** Duplicate originals, update amount and billcode fields (6 hrs)
- **Output Validation:** Confirm accuracy in updated files (6 hrs)
- **Utility/Bill No. ID:** Find and update utility bill numbers (4 hrs)
- **Error Report:** Create an error report Excel file (2 hrs)

Optimization & Deployment

- **Memory Mgmt:** Optimize for file/sheet volume (6 hrs)
- **Testing:** Exhaustive, multi-file test coverage (8 hrs)
- **Error Handling/Logging:** Robust error management and logs (6 hrs)
- **Deployment/Bug Fixes:** Launch and resolve issues (16 hrs)

Research & Development

10 hours

Total Project Estimate


90 hours

Item	Price	Qty	Subtotal
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Custom Development w/PM Hours broken down above. Fixed Bid not to go over	\$150.00 One Time	90	\$13,500.00

Subtotal \$13,500.00

Amount due \$13,500.00

Angela Pranata

 Signature

Select date

Robert McCarthy

Robert McCarthy

Select date